

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY

at KINGSTON

CA20NDA705
Government
- 73Q77 Publications

RESPONSE TO

TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION

suggested by the

COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS

November 1973

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I	Enrolment.	1
II	Undergraduate Studies.	13
III	Graduate Studies	18
IV	Health Sciences.	23
V	Research	45
VI	Part-time Students	47
VII	Faculty.	53
VIII	Status of Women.	59
IX	Student Support.	61
X	Finance - Operating.	65
XI	Finance Capital.	69
XII	Economics.	74
XIII	Miscellaneous.	77

FORMS

Form CUA-73-A	93
Form CUA-73-B	94
Form CUA-73-C	96
Form CUA-73-D	98

APPENDICES

The appendices are listed separately following on page 101.

SECTION I. ENROLMENT

1. *Comment on your long-term undergraduate and graduate projections (CUA-A),*

Our decision to limit growth at Queen's to a ceiling of 10,000 full-time students in this decade was formulated in 1969 for a number of positive reasons which can be summarized under such headings as, geographic and demographic considerations, the desire to maintain a pleasant, human environment supportive of academic objectives, balanced mix of academic activities, a limited stock of housing, the desire for constructive relations with the Kingston community. The decision was formulated at a time when the university system as a whole was still expected to continue to expand substantially although at a slower rate than in the 60's. Further comments about our enrolment projections will emerge in the following sections since they are closely related to the problems of resource allocation in the state of steady total enrolment to which we have devoted considerable attention in our annual presentations to the Committee on University Affairs and in the annual

series of Senate documents entitled *Academic Development at Queen's University*.

2. *Are you experiencing or do you expect to experience significant shifts in student preferences?*
5. *How do you propose to resolve the problem of changing student program preferences under the constraints of steady state enrolment and tenured faculty?*

The most marked shifts in recent years occurred first towards the newer and apparently more glamorous social sciences (sociology and psychology) and more recently towards the life sciences. The latter trend has in part reflected a generally increased student interest in professionally oriented programs and in part by the abolition of premedicine. Substantial numbers of students previously eliminated from competition for limited numbers of places in medicine in first year now enrol in life sciences with the intention of trying for medicine at the end of two years or after taking a life science degree. There are signs that the "swing" to life sciences has peaked and that it will be

possible to maintain a reasonable balance between life sciences and the other courses offered in the Faculty of Arts and Science without undue restrictions on student choice. Within the Faculty of Applied Science there has recently been a noticeable shift of interest towards civil engineering and some relative decline in chemical engineering.

The governing criteria of our planning have been to preserve an optimum balance among the various professional and other academic programs and to ensure effective student choice within the programs so far as professional requirements and degree regulations will permit. And, in fact, degree regulations have steadily altered in the direction of facilitating wider variety of student choice in specialized as well as general programs. Nevertheless, under conditions of steady total enrolment, the objectives of maintaining balance and wide student choice may come into conflict. We are concerned, as we have repeatedly said, with using our resources to make the most effective contribution to the educational needs of the society. It could become necessary therefore to consider controlling enrolments so that student

choice will not leave underused resources in staff and facilities to which we are fully committed.

The Faculty of Arts and Science has adopted a number of policies designed to ensure maximum flexibility in staffing and therefore optimum responsiveness to changing student preferences. Among these are a) the rotation of responsibilities within each department, particularly among the younger members of the academic staff; b) reserving vacancies where appropriate for visiting professors and active investigation of opportunities for recruiting such persons; c) arrangement of two-year leaves for some staff members who wish to develop new specializations appropriate to understaffed areas in the university. The Faculty also intends to explore the opportunities for greater flexibility provided under the university's leave policy (see Section VII); d) the Faculty has also implemented the university-wide policy (see page 5) of increasing the number of term appointments with a view to reducing the proportion of tenured and probationary appointments.

Even with the most imaginative measures,

however, it is not realistic to expect that the resources of a university can be made to respond altogether freely to demand except perhaps in the special case of rapid growth which allows additions to be made to academic programs without corresponding subtractions. Those conditions, which prevailed generally in the 60's, no longer, (need it be said?) apply.

Yet, altogether apart from the question as to how much freedom of student choice is desirable or practicable, no academic program (contrary to popular belief) is static. Each program is subject to constant scrutiny and change and therefore, a university whose real resources are shrinking is hard pressed to find ways of achieving the minimum flexibility required to respond to needed change and to maintain a vital and dynamic academic climate. The dilemma involved was, in 1970 entrusted to a task force on the steady state and, when it appeared that additional budgetary constraints were looming (sooner than were expected solely as a result of deliberately restricting further growth at Queen's) to a Principal's Committee on Resource Allocation. The Report of the latter was included in our presentation

to the Committee in 1971.* Its recommendations can be summarized very simply - wherever possible, action should be taken to reduce total salary commitments to full-time continuing academic and non-academic staff. This reduction was to be achieved so far as possible by attrition. So far as academic staff was concerned, increased numbers were not precluded, but all prospective appointments were to be judged against overall plans to reduce the number of tenured appointments over the next four or five years. Considerable progress has been made in reducing fixed commitments as recommended in the 1971 Report. More detailed discussion on these matters will follow in our comments in section X.1, XI.2, and XII.

3. *What is your policy on class size?*

There are both positive and negative aspects to this question. Partly as a result of the Principal's Committee on Teaching and Learning several years ago, it was generally agreed that every student should have some experience of small classes. Positive efforts to increase opportunities for such experience especially for students

* An extract of this report is given in Appendix D1.

enrolled in non-specialist three year degree programs were successful and the resulting reallocation of teaching effort to first and second year students was fully reported in our presentation to the Committee in 1971. At the same time, efforts were made to reduce the number of very small classes on grounds of economy, and the number of very large classes on grounds that these are academically unsatisfactory. Since 1970-71 the overall pattern has not changed much as the following table indicates.

Class Hours Per Week

1972/3 (Fall Term) 1970/71 (Fall Term)

	<u>Total</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>%</u>
--	--------------	----------	--------------	----------

Size

1-2	131	4.0	129	3.9
3-10	677	20.7	688	20.8
11-20	723	22.0	790	23.8
21-40	881	26.9	771	23.3
41-60	409	12.5	410	12.4
61-80	186	5.7	254	7.7
81-100	113	3.4	104	3.1
101-150	103	3.1	90	2.7
151-250	51	1.6	70	2.1
250 plus	<u>3</u>	<u>0.1</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>.2</u>
	3,277	100.0	3,312	100.0

As the table shows, however, the number of class hours has remained nearly constant while enrolment (excluding education) has increased by about six percent. The most noticeable impact of increased enrolment without corresponding increases in faculty numbers is shown to be in the class-size 21-40. Class size decisions within departments depend on judgements about the style of teaching involved. Seminars and studio classes are normally limited to small groups. The number of lecture sections for a course will depend on assumptions about relationship between size of class and effectiveness of the lecture method. There are differences of opinion about these. But departmental decisions will be constrained by the number of faculty and teaching assistants available. These are matters of resource allocation which will be discussed as noted in sections X, XI, and XII.

4. *To what extent are 'stop-outs' re-entering your University? Are they coming back as full-time or part-time students?*

A 'stop-out' is, by definition, a 'drop-out' who has returned to the university.

We did not experience a remarkable increase in undergraduate 'drop-outs' at the time when other universities in the province were reporting such a change, and we do not now have a large conversion of 'drop-outs' to 'stop-outs'. Of 85 students returning to full-time study this year after a year's absence from the campus, 25 have continued their study elsewhere, usually as a desirable part of the program, as for example, in modern languages. Of the remaining 60, 13 are repeating previous work, 38 are continuing as originally planned and 9 have transferred into other programs at Queen's. Twenty undergraduate students have returned to Queen's after two year's absence from the campus: 7 have received credit for a year's study elsewhere, 7 are repeating previous work and 6 are continuing their studies as planned. Thus the sum of one and two year 'stop-outs' is 73, if one excludes those who have been studying elsewhere. Few have returned as part-time. Much of the transfer from full-time to part-time studies at Queen's occurs when students lack a fraction of a year's work to complete their programs. More than a hundred such students received their degrees at the June 1973 convocation.

5. *See above*

6. *Is the University Applications Centre fulfilling your expectations?*

Yes. It is working well in managing multiple applications and thus making it possible to deal much more certainly with admissions in the future as comparable data is accumulated year by year.

We approve the principle on which the Centre operates - i.e. that it is concerned with processing applications and is not concerned with the process of selection. We note that the Centre is justified by the benefits to the applicants and the universities resulting from a smoother and better informed admissions process. In our experience there is no net saving in total costs within the university.

Potentially the Centre may be able to offer assistance with admissions to professional programs where multiple applications present serious problems. Medical faculties are planning to use the Centre beginning in 1974. We think this possibility should also be explored by law faculties in the province.

7. *What is your policy on the admission of non-Canadian students?*

8. *What is your policy on the admission of students from other provinces?*

For many years the student body at Queen's has reflected the following geographic origins

80%	-	Ontario
13 - 14%	-	rest of Canada
6 - 7%	-	foreign

We believe that substantial numbers of students from other parts of Canada and the world contribute in important ways to the breadth of educational opportunities for all students at Queen's. A diverse student body is an essential element of the educational process as we see it. We have therefore made long-standing efforts to encourage students to come to Queen's from other parts of Canada. In recent years we have strengthened these efforts with the help of our alumni and have instituted a special national bursary program for this purpose as well. A substantial part of the private funds available to us for scholarship

and bursary purposes is directed to non-Ontario students. For example about one-third of scholarship and bursary awards to first year students this year went to students from other parts of Canada.

It might be argued that, ideally, a larger proportion of the student body should come from elsewhere in Canada. It is our experience in recent years, however, that special efforts are needed to maintain the present proportion.

Opportunities for university education have expanded in all provinces. It would be unrealistic therefore to suppose that we are likely to be able to attract substantially increased numbers of students from the more geographically distant provinces and territories. We are determined, however, to maintain the present mix of students by any reasonable means.

So far as possible, of course, standards of admission for all students from other jurisdictions are equivalent to those required of Ontario students. Tests for competence in English are required, as a matter of course, of foreign students whose mother tongue is not English.

SECTION II. UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES

1. *Describe any new undergraduate program innovations which you wish to bring to the committee's attention.*

The Faculty of Applied Science will introduce in 1973/74 an experimental program for students in the first year who experience difficulties in maths, physics, and chemistry because of uneven preparation in these subjects in high school. The program will in effect provide such students with a third term in these subjects and it is hoped that with this additional opportunity most students who might otherwise have had to repeat their first year will be able to enter second year in the fall of 1974. The problem of remedial work is discussed at greater length in the section on admissions in the document *Academic Development at Queen's University Report #5* which forms part of the documentation presented to the Committee on University Affairs (Appendix A).

Last year in Report #4 we drew attention to the history of *Nature, Science and Man* which provided an interdisciplinary option for students in the Faculty of Applied Science. Two courses will again be offered in the fall and winter terms of 1973/74 and for the first time students in the Faculty of Arts and Science will be

permitted to take these courses for credit.

Another successful ongoing interdisciplinary innovation is the life sciences program in which six departments (Anatomy, Biochemistry, Microbiology and Immunology, Physiology, Biology and Pharmacology) work together in offering a common three years in the B.Sc. program students wishing to specialize in one of the life sciences.

Selected first year students in engineering this year for the first time may be permitted by the Dean to take a first year biology course in place of the usual geology requirement. This will make it possible for a student to follow an engineering program with an environmental minor or to transfer to Arts and Science and to follow a bioscience program.

In 1973/74 the first students have been admitted to a new 'special field' program designated 'French Language, Translation, and French Canadian Studies' which is designed to provide students with the skills required for work in translation and interpretation. We are also interested through this program in increasing the study of French Canada. This program is seen as filling a real need as bilingual policies continue to be implemented at the federal and provincial levels.

The Senate has approved a concurrent program in teacher education to be planned and developed jointly by the

Faculty of Arts and Science and the Faculty of Education at Queen's. The program will be four or five years in length and will prepare students for professional teaching responsibilities at both the elementary and secondary school levels.

The Senate has also approved the co-operative development with Trent University of a concurrent program of teacher preparation to be planned by the Faculty of Arts and Science at Trent and the Faculty of Education at Queen's. Details are to be worked out by a joint committee of the two universities and presented to the respective Senates no later than October 1974.

A Department of Family Medicine has been created within the Medical Faculty. This is described more fully in Section IV.

2. *Comment on the calibre of recent entrants from Ontario high schools.*

A general impression is that the calibre of recent high school graduates varies very much from school to school. Generally speaking students come from the high schools with more diverse educational backgrounds than was the case a few years ago and with less depth in certain subjects than before. Fewer students are well drilled in basics such as computational skills and the use of

language. We have already noted the remedial steps taken by the Faculty of Applied Science in response to the unevenness of preparation in certain subjects. Similar arrangements are being considered by the Faculty of Arts and Science. There appears to be evidence that a good many high schools are beginning to question the complete freedom of choice which has typified so many programs in high schools recently and that in the next few years we may see a swing back to a more specific core program with the area of choice being somewhat limited in comparison with present practice. The Science Teachers' Association of Ontario recently submitted to the Minister of Education a proposal for developing a new core curriculum in a number of subjects. The general problem is to be discussed this fall by the liaison committee of the Council of Ontario Universities and the Ministry of Education.

Students admitted to the undergraduate commerce program at Queen's must still have grade XIII qualifications in mathematics and english. The School of Business is certain that there are advantages in these requirements in spite of the different levels of preparation which they may represent for individual students. As already mentioned the wider implications of high school preparation for admissions policy in the university and for

curriculum are discussed at greater length in SCAD
Report #5.

SECTION III. GRADUATE STUDIES

1. *What is your attitude to the ACAP planning assessments? Do you foresee any implementation difficulties?*

We believe that any consideration of ACAP procedures must proceed within a generally understood framework for planning in the Ontario system. We have addressed ourselves to the need for such a framework context on previous occasions: see Section VIII, of *Academic Development at Queen's University, Report #4, "University/Government Interface for Planning"*.* We think the need is now more urgent than ever in view of the completion of several planning assessments and the need for action on their recommendations. In general we suggest certain principles:

- (a) universities initiate planning
- (b) ACAP and other COU councils and committees assist in exchange of information and critical comment on university plans
- (c) the appropriate government agency, The Committee on University Affairs (or its successor) comments on the plans
- (d) the university presents revised plans
- (e) the government agency approves plans for funding for a period of time (say 2 or 3 years) which will be extended each year.

* See Appendix D ii.

The procedures through which such an iterative process can be effectively carried out might take a number of forms. It is, however, essential, in our view, that any planning system set out clearly the responsibilities of the various elements in the system including the role of government agencies. This the present ACAP planning documents signally fail to do. In other words, universities should plan and revise plans in the light of exchange of information with other universities taking into account comments from ACAP and its consultants and comment from CUA itself. At some stage the plan has to be approved for funding purposes and such approval must, in our view, come from the government agency supplying the funds. We attach as Appendix C a document setting out our views on the role of ACAP assessments within a framework consistent with the principles outlined. We think this offers a fruitful basis for further discussion of this admittedly difficult and perplexing area of concern.

Further, in connection with planning assessments and the endeavour to foster graduate training of the highest standards, Queen's University would regard favourably consideration of creating a central admissions system for students entering the Ph.D. program. The system should be established by the universities collectively, and should be based upon the academic achievement of

the student. The agencies of such a system virtually exist in the form of adjudicating bodies of the national councils or the projected central body for the awarding of provincial scholarships. It is not intended that the central admissions system should replace the procedures of individual universities, but be preliminary to them. The student, having been accepted by the provincial system, must be able to apply to any Ontario university which must be free to accept or reject him according to its individual standards and circumstances. The provincial agency might, however, wish to eliminate students not meeting the minimum standard from calculations for operating support. There are obviously many details to be worked out to bring such a system into effect, but it could help to ensure the development throughout Ontario of graduate work to international standards.

In order to avoid any possible misunderstanding, we should add that the principle of centrally established minimum standards for admission is one which we accept only in relation to doctoral work. The problems here are well recognized - quality and strictly limited resources. On the other hand we continue to believe that admission to undergraduate, professional, and master's work should remain solely for decision by each university. Only in this way can the strengths of each institution

respond flexibly and effectively to the rapidly changing conditions in society and the varying needs of individuals.

2. *Do you endorse the concept of "provisional embargo"?*

Yes, when applied with common sense. We believe, however, that where a highly specialized graduate program is urgently required at once and where the total number of students potentially involved is very small, it should not necessarily be made to lose a year or two while the discipline of which it is a part is fully assessed.

3. *Describe any program innovations which you wish to bring to the Committee's attention.*

The Senate has approved and the Ministry of University Affairs has authorized subject to successful appraisal a small inter-disciplinary program in Art Conservation. This is a program of the kind mentioned above where an immediate response is needed to help alleviate a clearly identified and world-wide shortage of persons trained in conservation techniques and who are needed if the federal program for expanding museums and galleries is to be implemented without undue delay. The program will involve

the disciplines of chemistry, physics and metallurgy as well as art history and classics. Students will spend two years in one of two parallel programs with areas of common studies. The M.A. in Art Conservation will be oriented toward treatment of works of art and artifacts. The M.Sc. in Art Conservation Science will be oriented toward research in polymer chemistry, metallic corrosion etc. Periods of internship with the National Gallery and other major institutions in Canada and abroad will be integrated with the academic program. Queen's expects to propose an M.A. in Art History in due course. But this would be quite separate from the Art Conservation program and will be put forward for separate appraisal in due course.

SECTION IV. HEALTH SCIENCES

1. *How will new provincial guidelines on medical schools effect your institution?*

2. *Are you involved in any regional organization concerned with the delivery of health care?*

In matters concerning provincial guidelines on education in the health sciences, the university does not relate simply to a single government agency. The Ministry of Colleges and Universities and the Ministry of Health are both concerned and often directly involved in policy development and implementation.

Clinical training in medicine and the other health sciences involves caring for patients in teaching hospitals and other clinical facilities. These two activities, teaching students and treating the sick, are not always directly compatible in terms of efficiency, especially when funds are very limited and budgets are subject to separate sets of guidelines issued by the two Ministries concerned.

A fundamental and on-going problem for the medical school has been to discern government policies, not as they apply to hospitals or to universities, but as they

apply to universities and affiliated teaching hospitals together providing for the clinical education of health care professionals. Since abolition of the old provincial integrating body, the Senior Coordinating Committee, the absence of a single voice to define policy at the interface between the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Colleges and Universities has been a substantial handicap to the development of long term academic policies for the Health Sciences at Queen's University. In the past several years we have had great difficulty in obtaining decisions from government. Serious delays in the implementation of plans and programs have resulted.

Enrolment of Undergraduate and Postgraduate Students in Medicine

a) Undergraduate medical students

Until recently the Faculty of Medicine had planned to increase the size of the undergraduate medical class from 72 to 100, increasing by increments of 10 every 3 years as clinical facilities and resources were developed and expanded. The major input for this planned increase was the widespread understanding that Ontario medical schools should increase their output dramatically. Since the announcement that the province will permit only a modest increase in the number of medical graduates, we have revised our plans. The Faculty of Medicine will continue to accept

70 - 75 students a year and plans at most for modest expansion to 80 per year by 1978-9.

The revised provincial policy, while disappointing when considered against the very large number of qualified applicants, is not inconsistent with Queen's policy of steady enrolment. The Faculty of Medicine has a very limited capacity to increase enrolment given that the number of beds for clinical teaching has been reduced and resources generally are limited by the small population base of the eastern Ontario region. Further it is essential to maintain a healthy balance between undergraduate and post-graduate students and those in nursing and other health sciences programs.

b) Family medicine and the other medical specialities

The provincial guideline that a major proportion of the graduating medical class should choose careers in primary contact medicine is not expected to affect the medical school. It has been the long-standing policy of the Faculty of Medicine to design and operate the curriculum to produce an undifferentiated graduate equally qualified for further study and work in family medicine or any other specialty. The choice of career goal is after all a matter of personal ambition which may be influenced but certainly not determined by the structure and content of the undergraduate curriculum.

Surveys over several years have revealed that half or better of Queen's graduates intend careers in first-contact medicine. Continuance of this pattern is expected with implementation this year of the decision by the university to establish a separate Department of Family Medicine. This will provide a well-defined focus and emphasis on family medicine in the undergraduate curriculum as well as in postgraduate residency training and will complement our established and on-going programs in other clinical specialties.

It is anticipated that graduating students will continue to choose their eventual career goals in medicine as they have in the past, on the basis of their own aspirations, ambitions and aptitudes.

c) Postgraduate medical education

Our understanding is that the provincial guidelines permit maintenance or only slight increase in the total number of postgraduate trainees in the province while encouraging emphasis on family practice or first-contact medicine so that 50% of completing trainees enter this specialty. If this policy were to be applied rigidly to enrolment within each medical school or to be implemented precipitously, it would have a major and deleterious effect on both the undergraduate and postgraduate programs

of the Faculty of Medicine.

At Queen's, the postgraduate training programs in medicine, surgery, obstetrics, psychiatry, and the other clinical specialities are small compared to those in the major urban centres. The enrolment in each is related to the need for every medical school to provide for the education of its students in each of the several disciplines which make up the expanding field of medicine. It is as well related to the need within the community, district, and region to provide for the full range of specialist clinical services commensurate with operation of the Queen's and Kingston Health Sciences Complex as the referral centre for the eastern Ontario region. It is the established policy of the Ministry of Health to reduce duplication in community and district hospitals to the minimum and permit operation of expensive speciality services only in regional centres.

The postgraduate medical programs at Queen's, including that in family medicine, have been planned and developed as small but viable and high-quality units in the essential specialty services while maintaining the overall balance between undergraduate and postgraduate education. Introduction of the new Department of Family Medicine will enable the Faculty to increase the number of trainees in this specialty. This is only possible as viable enrolments

are maintained to permit high-quality education and service in the existing range of specialities now operating. This matter of balance between education and service responsibilities, undergraduate and postgraduate programs, and between primary contact medicine and other specialty programs is especially delicate at Queen's, a small medical school providing referral services for a large region of relatively small population. This must be taken into account in applying provincial guidelines on postgraduate medical education at the Queen's and Kingston Health Sciences Complex.

Medical Education and Hospital Beds

Of particular concern to Queen's in relation to the requirements for undergraduate and postgraduate education and for clinical service to the region, is the provincial guideline describing as the norm for active treatment hospitals a ratio of 4 beds per 1,000 population. The Queen's and Kingston Health Sciences Complex was planned to incorporate 1,050 beds; application of a ratio of 4.5 beds per 1,000 in January, 1973, required closure of beds already in service to reach approximately 800 active treatment beds. Further reduction of that number would, despite maximum use of ambulant patient clinics and other facilities, make it necessary to establish priorities on meeting our

several responsibilities; first to ensure adequate clinical experience for the existing number of undergraduate students and postgraduate trainees, second to meet community, district, and regional needs for clinical service, and third to maintain the range of clinical specialty clinics and services required for clinical service in the regional referral centre or for undergraduate and postgraduate education in the medical school.

Again it is the question of balance of responsibilities as they apply to the medical school. The Ministry of Health has agreed to study the particular needs of the eastern Ontario region and especially the extent and variety of clinical resources and facilities which are needed to provide for medical education in this setting. The results of this study, which is expected to be completed in 1973 or early 1974, will provide important information to be considered by the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Colleges and Universities as well as by the university in planning for academic development in relation to provincial guidelines on education in the health sciences.

Nursing and Rehabilitation Therapy

The foregoing discussion has been confined to clinical services in medicine and to the education and training of doctors. It must be emphasized that the principles apply to the whole spectrum of health sciences and in particular

at Queen's to the School of Nursing and the School of Rehabilitation Therapy as well as to the Faculty of Medicine.

Enrolment in both programs is directly related to available clinical resources, physical facilities, and to the number of qualified faculty as it is in medical education. In fact, it is necessary to consider a balance in the use of resources and facilities between undergraduate and graduate students in medicine, students in nursing and in rehabilitation therapy and full time staff of the health care team. The present clinical resources in hospitals are strained to provide minimal essential practice in patient care. In addition, practice in giving and evaluating nursing care in ambulatory clinics and the community is essential for development of broad competency in health care and teaching. Relatively lavish space is required to permit students to have time to develop skills.

The optimum ratio of nursing to medical students to patients and to staff is unknown. Achieving a balance requires careful organization and experimentation with a variety of patterns. Experience in collaborative practice in the delivery of health care seems the most promising means of achieving the goal of interdependence among professional colleagues. Newer patterns of health care delivery will require a high degree of flexibility in

concepts of inter-relationships and responsibilities.

This requires the most careful and painstaking organization of personnel and resources. The educational process must not impose intolerable inefficiencies (and expenses) on the provision of clinical service and, from the other side of the coin, the provision of fast and efficient patient care must not impede education of the inexperienced learner.

Basic Health Sciences

The non-clinical departments in the Faculty of Medicine also have a spectrum of responsibilities within and beyond the health sciences. In addition to providing education in the basic sciences to medical students, these departments have major teaching roles in the School of Nursing, the School of Rehabilitation Therapy, the School of Physical and Health Education, the School of Graduate Studies and Research, and to a large and increasing extent in the life sciences and related programs of the Faculty of Arts and Science. Policies affecting the health sciences, especially in respect of the construction of new facilities, must take all of this into account.

Effective education and efficient health care, these are two necessary goals of the university and its partner

institutions in the health sciences. Integration and coordination of guidelines at the provincial level between the two Ministries each with primary responsibility for one of these goals would affect the medical school and the other health sciences at Queen's in a most beneficial way. We urge the Committee on University Affairs to recommend the establishment of a single coordinating body or other mechanism to recommend, elucidate, and advise on the implementation of provincial policies and guidelines relating to education in the health sciences.

Regional Organizations Concerned with the Provision of Health Care

Evolving out of a voluntary organization which operated in a planning capacity for several years, the Queen's and Kingston Health Sciences Complex Council was formed by legal agreement in 1973. Queen's University, Kingston General Hospital, Hotel Dieu Hospital, Kingston Psychiatric Hospital, St. Mary's of the Lake Hospital, and St. Lawrence College of Applied Arts and Technology are partners in the Council which is responsible for the coordination of education, clinical service and research between and among the member institutions in the Queen's and Kingston Health Sciences Complex. While each institution will retain responsibility for its own operation, the new Council is responsible to ensure that the facilities, personnel, services, and

organization of the Complex are appropriate for the needs of the eastern Ontario region for health care services and education. Queen's University has thus become increasingly and directly involved in the provision of health care as well as the education of health care personnel for Kingston and eastern Ontario.

It has, of course, long been the case that full and part-time members of the clinical departments in the Faculty of Medicine through their appointments to the affiliated teaching hospitals have provided all specialist referral services required by patients and physicians in the community, and most in the district and region. A comprehensive family care practice has operated for some years to serve the Kingston community; with establishment of the Department of Family Medicine this will be enlarged and expanded in scope and concept.

The faculty in nursing has become involved in community services for several years as board members of the Kingston branch of the Victorian Order of Nurses. This past year one member worked consistently with the Eastern Regional Office of Ministry of Health to assist with the reorganization of the nursing services of a neighboring health unit. Another was involved first as consultant and later with a research project in a teaching hospital within the complex. Two other members have been

very much involved in the move of the diploma programs in nursing into the St. Lawrence College of Applied Arts and Technology. In northern Ontario, two faculty members and twelve students spent the intersession at the Moose Factory General Hospital: an excellent experience in comprehensive health care.

There are many other examples of the direct involvement of the university and its personnel with the organized health care system of the region. Formal and working arrangements have existed for some years with such organizations as the Regional Cancer Treatment Unit, the Community Home Care Program, the Regional Rehabilitation Unit, the Regional Public Health Laboratory, the Victorian Order of Nurses, to name but a few. It is considered policy to seek involvement and participation to the maximum extent practicable with comprehensive health care in all of its aspects on a regional basis.

To that end explorations are now underway to explore the feasibility of extending to Belleville, Peterborough and elsewhere in the region formal affiliations between the regional hospitals and the university; the Department of Family Medicine, once established in Kingston, is expected to play a prominent role in these developing relationships.

Continuing Education

The university health sciences have for many years

mounted a variety of programs and courses designed to meet the needs of physicians, nurses and other health care professionals in the region for continuing education. These range from short intensive courses either given in Kingston or in other centres in the region to a regular series of evening lectures sponsored by the Office of Continuing Medical Education. There is increasing need to organize and coordinate activities of this nature and to expand involvement of the university in continuing education throughout eastern Ontario. To this end, the University Council has established a Committee on Continuing Education on which the Faculty of Medicine is represented.

To this point, programs in continuing medical education have been mounted without registration of the participants in any formal way as part-time or extension students of the university; no credit or even mention has been made of these activities save in some instances connected with meeting the requirements of professional societies for evidence by their members of having participated in approved courses or programs. It is desirable that continuing education receive much greater emphasis than it has in the past and it may well be appropriate now to relate it directly and perhaps formally to part-time university study. It is our intention to initiate discussions with the Ministry of Colleges and Universities

and of Health and with the various professional organizations to explore the feasibility of this type of arrangement.

Construction of the Health Sciences Complex

The decision by the province to proceed with the long deferred construction at Kingston of the next of the five planned health sciences centres in Ontario will have a very major impact on education, clinical service and research in the health sciences at Queen's. New construction in all of the health sciences by the university and the affiliated hospitals has been deferred to the maximum practicable extent for nearly 10 years in anticipation of the decision to proceed with this major new development. As a consequence there is now an acute shortage of space in which to accommodate the demands for teaching, patient care, and research, all of which have increased several times since the mid 1960's.

With construction of an integrated health sciences complex this severe space limitation will be alleviated. It will facilitate the integration of health sciences teaching with the processes of patient care and treatment and the work of the basic and clinical science departments. It will allow for the development of new initiatives in teaching in ambulant and out-patient clinics that space

limitations have virtually precluded heretofore. New and expanded facilities for the School of Nursing and the School of Rehabilitation Therapy will permit greater integration of these programs with those in the Faculty of Medicine.

In short, the decision to proceed with health sciences construction in Kingston will make possible the integration and coordination of education and clinical service in medicine and the other health sciences which has been severely handicapped for some years because of the fragmented nature and sheer inadequacies of antiquated physical facilities.

Research

Research policy in the Faculty of Medicine has been clearly established and set down and is in general supervised and coordinated by the Committee on Research and Graduate Studies. This is a Faculty committee which is separate from but maintains close liaison with the School of Graduate Studies and Research through cross-appointments of key committee members.

The Faculty of Medicine has a primary concern in the establishment and maintenance of an environment conducive to research. This does not ordinarily involve funding the direct costs of investigations but rather the development

of policies to enhance research in respect of staffing and the use of space and equipment. The Faculty may, by selective budgetary, staffing, and space policies, encourage research efforts in specific areas it considers worthy of special attention.

The present research pattern in the Faculty of Medicine is, however, mainly one of relatively small projects undertaken by individuals or by small informal groups of individuals with related interests. New faculty members are often chosen to develop new areas of patient care, teaching, and research; the medical school at Queen's is small and with limited faculty cannot direct its resources of staff and facilities into a narrow discipline area. It is Faculty policy to continue to encourage research of this kind and at the same time as 'outside' funding is available, to create formal groups, centres, or institutes devoted to research in specific fields, for example, the Health Sciences Research Unit which for the past four years has been concerned with problems in health care delivery. It is recognized that it may be very difficult to accomplish both of these objectives. Further decisions on research policy will be taken when the provincial and federal policies on research in the universities are more clearly settled.

Research policy is administered by the Dean of the

Faculty of Medicine. Before a research project is initiated in the Faculty of Medicine, three categories of approval are necessary. The Dean and the head of the department concerned must be assured that the space, equipment and other facilities required are available or can be provided and that any costs which the university might incur directly or indirectly are identified and fully accounted for. If the research is of a clinical nature and involves patients or human volunteers, a Faculty Ethics Committee must review the protocol in detail and provide written assurance of the propriety of the proposal and its acceptability on ethical grounds. With research involving animals, the Animals for Research Act requires the University Animal Care Committee, including a member veterinarian, to review all protocols and take responsibility for the humane care and treatment of all animals used. These approvals are necessary before a research project can be initiated.

Initiation of research in the School of Nursing has been retarded by the priority necessarily given to development of the basic baccalaureate program and the restricted funds available under the present financing scheme. Current faculty-student contact hours leave no time available for the concentrated effort needed for research.

Clinical research proposals approved by the Dean would be reviewed jointly by the Faculty of Medicine Committee on

Ethics and the School of Nursing to assure ethical concern for those involved.

Part-time students

As mentioned above, the health sciences at Queen's perceive a real and significant part of their work in future as the provision of continuing education on a part-time basis. At the undergraduate level in medicine, nursing or rehabilitation the curricula include laboratory and hospital based courses which are not readily adaptable to the constraints of part-time studies. Courses of this nature are very expensive to duplicate, say in evening sessions, and often are impossible in cases for example when patients and hospital facilities are employed. Thus in general part-time students can be accommodated only to the extent that they are available to take courses given for the majority of regular students.

For continuing education, especially in medicine and nursing, the potentialities are much more real and, for that matter, necessary. Before significant new programs can be mounted in this area, however, it will be necessary to secure new sources of funding to meet the added costs which would be incurred.

a) Graduate Studies

Masters and Ph.D. programs in some health science disciplines are now offered on a part-time basis. The

demand, however, is not great. Graduate work in the medical and life sciences, because it has such a significant component of laboratory-based experimental work, is very difficult both for the institution and the student to organize on a part-time basis.

b) Postgraduate Studies

Opportunity now exists in some clinical departments of the Faculty of Medicine, Psychiatry in particular, for residency training on a part-time basis.

Faculty

Only with respect to professional income earned from clinical practice does policy in the health sciences differ in any respect from general university policy on such matters as tenure, sabbatical and other forms of leave, community involvement, summer school teaching and 'outside' income. The principles embodied in the statement, *The University Appointment: Freedom and Responsibility*, apply to all members of faculty in the health sciences and commit the professional endeavours of those members to the purposes of the university in teaching, research, clinical service, and administration throughout the 12 months of the year.

In clinical medicine, those geographic full-time members of faculty who see patients and provide clinical service as a direct consequence of their involvement with undergraduate and postgraduate teaching do so in partial

discharge of their university responsibilities. In this role they are at once members of faculty who spend the major portion of their time on academic activities and private physicians extending the benefit of their professional knowledge and skill to patients or institutions on a fee-for-service basis; in this last they are not different from other members of the medical profession. Their practices are, however, confined to university affiliated or approved facilities (Clinical Teaching Units). Each GFT physician agrees to a ceiling on his annual net income which is negotiated with the university and comprises a regular salary and fringe benefits payable by the university plus an amount derived from his fee-for-service income from private practice in Clinical Teaching Units. The ceiling income of clinical teachers is defined by guidelines derived from data on the professional income in the various practice specialties in Ontario and elsewhere, approved by the Dean of Medicine and the Principal and negotiated individually with his members by each department head. Practice income earned by GFT physicians above their ceiling incomes are paid to the university as rent for the facilities used. These funds are set aside in university and department trust funds to be used to further the purposes of the Faculty of Medicine and its several departments.

The same principal of income ceiling applies to the category of Major Part-time clinical teachers. Faculty members in this category receive only partial salary from the university but are permitted to engage in a limited amount of private practice outside of clinical teaching units and to derive from that income which is not subject to the ceiling arrangement. Other part-time clinical teachers are appointed to university departments. They are paid a stipend or honorarium for specified teaching or other responsibilities. They are not subject to a ceiling on the income they may derive from private practice.

Education in the health sciences is different from education elsewhere in the university. It can only proceed in an integrated and coordinated manner simultaneously with the practice of medicine and the provision of health care. This requires a balanced partnership of the educational institution with the individual physicians who make up its clinical faculty and with the hospitals and other institutions responsible for the facilities and services needed for health care in a given community, district or region. The foundation for this balance of partnership has been laid at Queen's with establishment of the Queen's and Kingston Health Sciences Complex Council. It must

be extended, strengthened, and, once fully achieved, maintained in order to meet the rising expectations of the people of Ontario for high quality education and health care service. It is essential to the firm establishment of this balance of partnership that government establish its guidelines in order to take into account all of the work that the university health sciences and the affiliated teaching hospitals must do. Given provincial guidelines which permit this balance to be maintained, we can meet the combined responsibilities for health care service and education in Queen's University, Kingston and this region of eastern Ontario.

SECTION V. RESEARCH

1. *What approvals are necessary before a professor can accept a research grant?*

All applications to outside organizations for research grants must first be approved by the department head and, in professional faculties, the dean of the faculty concerned. Applications must be signed on behalf of the university by the Director of the Office of Research Administration. Research contracts follow the same route except that in certain cases they are signed on behalf of the Board of Trustees and the university seal affixed.

Before research involving human subjects is approved, the proposers must demonstrate that appropriate ethical standards which respect fully the rights and interests of individuals are met. A review system is well established in the Faculty of Medicine. During the past year departments in other faculties have been working on a trial basis within guidelines proposed by the Advisory Research Committee on Ethics Review of Research Involving Human Subjects. In the light of experience with these guidelines a formal policy statement will be developed for Senate approval.

What is your policy on research and how is it administered?

In SCAD Report #4 which was presented to the Committee

a year ago we discussed the role of research at Queen's at some length. The conclusion of that discussion was that judgements about the relative value of individual research work will be implicit in the distribution of teaching duties and that these judgements are best arrived at within the departments rather than by the imposition of norms for teaching or external tests for individual research. In SCAD #5 (Appendix A) we have brought this discussion up to date with a summary of the report on Institutional Policies and Objectives in Research prepared by the Advisory Committee on Research of the School of Graduate Studies and Research.

Research policy is developed and recommended to the Senate and the Principal by the Dean, Graduate Studies and Research and the Advisory Committee on Research. Policy is administered by the Office of Research Administration currently under the direction of the Associate Dean of Graduate Studies and Research.

SECTION VI. PART-TIME STUDENTS

1. *What progress has been made on the implementation of guidelines for part-time students?*

Two years ago we reported to the Committee on University Affairs that part-time and full-time undergraduate studies at Queen's are fully integrated in the sense that classes held on campus during the day, in the evening, or at summer school are open to all registered students whether part-time or full-time and subject to a single set of academic regulations for the Faculty of Arts and Science. All night classes in the winter, whether offered in Kingston or at four outside centres, are included in the master timetable. The correspondence courses offered by the Faculty of Arts and Science are also open to all students, full-time or part-time.

Considerable effort has been put into improving communications between correspondence students and instructors through provision of audio tapes, the telephone, week-end seminars, better study guides and more efficient administration.

The Faculty of Arts and Science is committed to proceed with the integration of teaching so that courses offered in the regular session, and the spring and the

summer sessions are taught by members of the regular academic staff as a normal part of their university responsibility. In 1972/73, 68 per cent of courses offered at night were integrated in this sense. Out of a total of 137½ courses offered (37 evening, 101½ intersession and summer school) 27 per cent were taught by full time staff who receive no additional compensation for these duties. By 1974/75 one-half of spring and summer session courses and all of the evening courses offered in the Kingston area are to be integrated.

We wish, however, to stress the points which we made two years ago in discussing these matters with the Committee i.e. that we fully endorse the principle of putting part-time students on an equal footing with full-time students in all respects so far as the accessibility to and quality of the programs offered is concerned. We do not agree, however, that the realization of this goal depends upon the way in which instructors may be paid. In some cases it may remain true for some time that, because of particular circumstances, it may make more sense to pay additional stipends for additional teaching even if the general thrust of our policy is in the opposite direction. It is highly important, however, to have in place procedures which require approval at a senior administrative level of all arrangements for paying instructors either full-time

or part-time. As is clear from the university statement on the responsibilities of faculty members and the rules for implementation of these principles within each faculty, this is now being done. (See Section VII)

2. *Do you have any suggestions for increasing the accessibility for part-time students?*

A crucial factor in accessibility for part-time students is the availability of student aid. We discuss this in Section IX.

Although in the Kingston area we do not experience the heavy pressures for additional part-time work which may be found in the larger metropolitan centres, we have increased substantially the number of courses offered in the evenings, both in Kingston and the surrounding area, and are prepared to expand this as enrolment demand justifies. There are no barriers within the university to attendance by part-time students at regular day time lecture and laboratory courses in the Faculty of Arts and Science.

Such opportunities have increased since courses were first offered in the spring session in 1972. We also offer evening courses in other parts of our region where such services are not duplicated by other universities. Belleville

and Brockville are the main centres for our evening courses. But we have recently extended these on an experimental basis to Madoc and Cloyne.

The Faculty of Education plans to offer some units of the Master of Education program off campus during the coming year to provide greater accessibility for M.Ed. students. The Ministry of Education apparently wishes faculties of education to replace its own in-service courses for teachers, and the Faculty of Education at Queen's hopes to extend its services in this way if an appropriate level of funding can be provided.

Part-time work in some of the other professional programs is more problematic. We have discussed at length the pressures for full-time admission to these programs in SCAD Report #5 (Appendix A). Here there are two problems which limit accessibility for part-time students. The first is that total admission to such programs as nursing, rehabilitation therapy and medicine, is strictly limited by the clinical resources available for teaching purposes. Therefore a part-time student must displace a full-time student. Because of the very heavy demands on full-time students there is the further argument that satisfactory professional qualification cannot be achieved on a part-time basis. The same argument is made with respect to law although it is perhaps less convincing

in this case. Apparently there is some question as to whether the Law Society of Upper Canada would recognize a degree earned on a part-time basis. In this case, however, there would seem to be an argument for allowing part-time students (most of whom would be married women) to proceed at a rate of not less than a half load each year so that the courses taken in the early part of the program would not be outdated by the time the degree qualification was earned.

In engineering there is no objection on principle to part-time study and consideration is being given to the possibility of introducing both correspondence and spring term courses to increase accessibility to the Applied Science programs for part-time students. There would, however, be difficulties in meeting the laboratory requirements for correspondence courses but arrangements might be made to conduct these on Saturdays. Night courses probably will not be offered in Applied Science because of the limited demand in the Kingston area.

3. *Do you offer or do you have any plans to offer Masters and Ph.D.'s on a part-time basis?*

The Master of Education program is taken mainly by students who are part-time during the school year and then

attend the summer program.

In the Faculty of Applied Science both Masters and Ph.D. programs can be taken on a part-time basis. In the graduate school generally some students in almost every discipline go on to a part-time status after meeting their residence requirements depending on their personal circumstances.

The School of Business is able to accommodate students who wish to work part time for an M.B.A. There is not a large demand in the Kingston area. However, up to 25 students from regional industries have been involved on a part-time basis in each of the past four or five years. There is no problem of accessibility for these students provided that their employers allow them the necessary time. There is some evidence that educational leave for full-time study is being considered more frequently now by industrial and governmental organizations. If this trend continues, the graduate student can begin his or her work on a part-time basis and then spend a concentrated period say a year in residence and gain benefits not available in a completely part-time program.

In the proposed doctoral program in business there will be a provision for an experimental internship component which means that some students will spend time on the analysis of a real problem in a business organization.

SECTION VII. FACULTY

1. *What are your policies on tenure, sabbaticals, community involvement, summer school teaching, and professional income earned from extra-university sources?*

University policies on tenure, sabbatical leave and faculty responsibilities -- which encompass summer school teaching, community involvement and professional income earned from extra university sources -- have been established by the Senate and are set out in the accompanying documentation.

Tenure Policy

The *Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure** has been in effect since April 1969. Although this statement has not been formally amended, Section IV, *Grievance Procedures*, is now replaced by recommendations 47 to 50 of the *Statement on Grievance Discipline and Related Matters* (Item XIII.4 and see Appendix B). Since the question of academic freedom is fundamental to a university, the document is given to all newly appointed faculty members.

Academic Leave Policy

We noted in our presentation last year that sabbatical leave was being reviewed by the Senate Committee on Appoint-

* Appendix B ii

ment, Promotion, Tenure and Leave in the light of the expectations and constraints which would face Queen's in the period of constant student enrolment. That Senate committee was concerned lest stabilized enrolment might lead to an impoverished intellectual climate and reduced flexibility to meet changing student needs for new courses and programs. It therefore developed the *Statement on Academic Leave Policy** which the committee believed would effectively counter possible declines in quality and flexibility.

The policy provides for the more traditional sabbatical period devoted to study and research. Faculty members may use this period to become proficient in new areas of teaching.

The policy also provides for negotiated leave. For many members of faculty there is a wide range of temporary employment opportunities available. When the employment offered is related to a member's discipline or field of scholarly expertise and in fact may be the type of applied research or study usually associated with sabbatical, he has the option of applying for a negotiated leave. Since this leave may be taken at any time and since the salary arrangements are negotiated in each particular case, negotiated leave ensures that leave policy is flexible and responsive to university needs.

The Senate statement is viewed as general policy and each

* Appendix B iii

faculty has been asked to develop its own regulations and procedures in keeping with it. The responsibility for funding sabbatical leave, including replacements if needed, rests entirely with the faculties and departments. The Principal, however, must approve the arrangements made.

The responsibilities of faculty

The university policy on the responsibilities and duties of members of faculty are set out in the document *The University Appointment: Freedom and Responsibility* (Appendix B iv). The document states that faculty members are responsible to the university throughout the twelve month year unless a shorter employment period has been arranged. During this period each faculty member is expected to devote all of his professional endeavours to the purposes of the university. Professional endeavours include all teaching, scholarship and research, professional service, consulting and related work. Community service would also be included if it is related to a faculty member's expertise.

The purposes of the university, however, may be served by outside teaching, consulting or other activities. The policy states that the nature and extent of a faculty member's participation in such work are matters to be agreed upon beforehand with the university. Such agreement involves judgements which relate to academic decisions

and considerable differences in circumstances and should be decided at the faculty level. The policy therefore charges each faculty dean, in consultation with his faculty board, to establish regulations and procedures on these matters for approval by the Principal.

The Senate policy received formal approval by the Board of Trustees in October, 1972. This past academic year, the faculties have developed their own policies in keeping with the Senate statement.

Professional income from extra university sources

There is general agreement that except for the Faculty of Medicine where there are detailed regulations on professional income, it is the amount of effort and time spent on outside activity rather than the amount of professional income earned from extra university sources which should be the university's concern. The regulations on outside work reflect this view.

In all faculties, persons undertaking any onerous or long term obligations likely to interfere with their primary responsibilities are required to discuss them with the department head (or dean) in advance and obtain consent. Certain faculties, Applied Science for example, have established criteria in terms of the number of days worked, which define occasional professional service of a limited scope and those of a more long term nature. Limits have

been placed on the total number of days an individual faculty member may spend on such activities. In all faculties the nature and extent of outside work must be discussed with the department head or dean as part of the annual review for salary and promotion.

It also should be noted here that if any faculty member expects to use the facilities or personnel of the university while engaged in outside, professional work, he must obtain approval in advance from his department head. Contractual obligations regarding the use of university faculties and personnel require the approval of the department head, the dean and clearance from the University Office of Research Administration.

At Queen's, faculty members may and do teach at other institutions when this activity is considered to be in keeping with their prime responsibility to the university. The normal regulations on outside work apply.

Summer school teaching

In most faculties and schools, a member of faculty is expected to engage in teaching to the extent determined by his department head and dean. Teaching includes any form of instruction, tutoring, supervision and counselling which is the responsibility of the academic department. Teaching duties may include integrated courses taught in programs offered through the Department of Extension

(summer school and spring session (intersession)).

Community involvement

The university, as an institution, has played an active role in the Kingston community. Our response to question XIII.1 gives some indication of the use of our facilities. The program of the Agnes Etherington Art Centre and our ties with the Kingston Symphony Association are two noteworthy examples of community involvement.

Many faculty members take an active role in community activities. They are expected to report such activity only if it falls within the definition of professional service, consulting and related work. Otherwise 'community service' is a private concern of the individual as a citizen.

SECTION VIII. STATUS OF WOMEN

1. *Do you have a policy on the hiring, remuneration, and promotion of women in all fields of employment in your institution?*

2. *Do you have a policy on equal opportunity for women in admissions to all programs?*

It is Queen's policy that all women members of the university community receive equitable and non-discriminatory treatment in every aspect of the university operations. In order to ascertain if present practices are in keeping with this policy, the Principal has appointed a committee to review the status of women at Queen's in their roles as members of the academic faculty, members of the administrative and academic support staff and as students. The committee is charged to make whatever recommendations it deems necessary and appropriate to realize this policy.

The committee began its work last September 1972. It has reviewed hiring practices, promotion policies and salary levels for women employed. It has carefully examined admissions policies and procedures in each faculty and studied scholarship and student aid programs to determine if women, once admitted, receive sufficient

financial support.

The annual meeting of the University Council in June convened an afternoon workshop session on the status of women and provided a useful sample of opinion on a number of matters which will be useful to the committee.

The committee has not yet completed its work but does expect to report to the Principal before the new year.

SECTION IX. STUDENT SUPPORT

1. *What effect has the new student award plan had? Can you suggest further revisions to OSAP?*

The present OSAP scheme does not remove all financial barriers to accessibility and there are varying views among students and staff at Queen's about the degree to which recent revisions are likely to further the goal of full accessibility. The answers to the questions asked by CUA are therefore not intended to imply satisfaction with the overall design of the plan. They are limited to the scope of this question without intending to endorse the plan itself.

Undoubtedly the revisions to the student award plan last spring made a number of students eligible for support in the current year who would otherwise not have been able to qualify. Statistically, however, there was no noticeable increase in the number of applications received by the end of September in comparison with the numbers received in September of 1972. It may be that some students are not yet aware of the revised scheme. It was however publicized fully on the Queen's campus before many students left last spring. There was a substantial article in the Queen's Journal at that time.

Our major concern about the future of OSAP is for the part-time student and the full-time student who seeks to accelerate his program by taking courses during the spring session or the summer session. We think that it should be possible for a student to take one or two courses during the spring session or indeed the summer session, without being penalized in qualifying for aid in the following year. The present regulation requires that a student do a total of three full-time courses during the spring and summer in order to qualify as a full-time student and, therefore, be eligible for full OSAP assistance. Thus a student must be 'full-time' in order to get assistance and in order not to be penalized when he becomes a full-time student again in the fall.

Many students who carry a course load of two courses at once during the spring or summer sessions can do little more than 'work-off the credit' with minimum academic benefit. The work is highly concentrated and there is not time for adequate reading and reflection. It is the strong and carefully considered view of our faculty after experience with two spring sessions that students should be discouraged from taking more than one course at a time particularly those with heavy reading requirements. A student taking one course may be able to work part-time but will not be able to do justice to his academic

program if he is working full-time. He will therefore lose some of the income which he might otherwise earn. Yet the present regulations make no allowance for lower earning capacity when his entitlement to OSAP assistance is calculated for the coming academic year. In other words the present regulations do not take into account academic realities and in fact encourage practices which for most students will be academically unsound. The student who does enrol in two courses in either spring session or summer session should be considered as a full-time student for the session concerned. He should qualify for full assistance and should not be expected to earn any money.

The new loan scheme for part-time students appears to involve a considerable administrative load for very little benefit to the student. We are disappointed that the revised scheme which includes grants for students in difficult circumstances is apparently not applicable to Queen's. While the numbers of such students in Kingston may be relatively small, we do not think they are any less deserving than persons in similar circumstances elsewhere.

Only if grants are generally available will part-time study be made really accessible to adults with low incomes and heavy family responsibilities who face substantial financial barriers to part-time university work. For example, they may have to forego overtime earnings, face additional

transportation and baby-sitting costs.

If the objective is to increase flexibility of access to university opportunity for all students we think the OSAP scheme should be amended to take into account such circumstances wherever they occur.

2. *What is your policy on entrance scholarships?*

As the Committee is aware, the Council of Ontario Universities has appointed a committee to formulate guidelines for entrance scholarship policy for the Ontario universities. The whole matter of scholarships and student aid within the university is to undergo a thorough review by the Senate Committee on Scholarships and Student Aid during the coming year. There is a preliminary discussion of the issues involved in SCAD Report #5 (Appendix A). We enclose copies of the publication, *Admission Bulletin and Scholarship Information 1974*, for members of C.U.A.

SECTION X. FINANCE - OPERATING

1. *What is your policy concerning internal budget allocations?*

We have already made some general observations about resource allocation. More specifically final budget allocations are made to faculties following a lengthy iterative process which begins with an estimate of probable revenue and the establishment of tentative faculty budget targets based on the best information available such as probable internal shifts in enrolment, continuing staff commitments and so on. Once faculty budgets are struck, deans are allowed as much leeway as possible in assigning departmental budgets and in adjusting these during the course of the year to meet unforeseen exigencies. However, all staff appointments including replacements which involve permanent payroll commitments must be approved by the Principal for academic staff or the Vice-Principal (Finance) for non-academic staff.

While such measures as staff/student ratios, course registrations and so on are considered on both a university-wide and faculty basis in arriving at budgetary allocations, the final decisions are based on judgement about many other relevant factors which are not measurable in numerical terms.

We do not, in other words, use any formula system for internal distribution. The Principal is responsible for recommending the final budget for the approval of the Board of Trustees and budget-making is considered to be his administrative responsibility as chief executive. The Senate Budget Committee is empowered to review the budget retrospectively for its consistency with the stated academic objectives of the university and its advice can be taken into account in making the budget for the next fiscal year. The Senate does not, however, participate directly in the budget-making process.

2. *Is slip year financing a significant aid to planning or are any adjustments related to slip year necessary?*

The main advantage of the slip year system is that it delays the impact of enrolment changes for one year and thus allows the university to estimate more accurately its income for the coming budget year. Since Queen's is still growing slightly we lose the benefit of additional revenue for one year but once the system has been in effect for a year or two this slight disadvantage will be insignificant. In our circumstances of carefully controlled enrolment, the advantages and disadvantages of the slip year cancel

each other approximately.

3. *What is your current attitude to the present system of formula financing?*

We support a system of formula financing but would prefer to see the present formula simplified by reducing the number of separate categories. We hope that the basic principles of this formula i.e. simplicity and 'rough justice' will be maintained and perhaps strengthened in any revised or substitute formula which may be used in future. These principles are essential if the advantages of budget autonomy and responsibility within each institution are to be preserved. Of course this means that universities must be free in their internal budgeting to make mistakes on occasion. It is clear to us that the mistakes which may sometimes be made within individual institutions will be less grievous than mistakes made through any central budgeting system, and the inevitable standardizing effects of such systems.

4. *Can you suggest a method for arriving at the BIU value for 1975/76? What BIU value does your method yield?*

We are very much interested in the proposal for formula

revision now under discussion in CUA and COU. The principle of providing for sufficient increases in operating funds to offset inflation is not only desirable, but imperative if universities are not to suffer permanent and serious deterioration of quality. In section XII on Economies we have outlined our response to the circumstances of recent years which have seen a substantial gap between increases in revenues and increases in costs. Some economies have resulted in reduced services which can perhaps be considered to have lower priority. In other cases, reductions in service can be accepted for a limited period without permanent damage. If these continue, however, the long range consequences can be disastrous - for example library and academic equipment purchases, preventive maintenance. In these areas further reductions cannot be tolerated if we have any concern for the quality of what students are to be offered over the next decade. Nor can offsetting cuts in salaries be seriously contemplated. The temper of contemporary society is for the improvement of wages and salaries in all sectors to keep pace with inflation. University people whether academic or non-academic cannot be asked to accept an inferior position relative to others in the public sector.

SECTION XI. FINANCE CAPITAL

1. *How should cyclical renewal be generated?*

The present method of calculating the cyclical renewal allowance appears to us to be a generally satisfactory method of generating cyclical funds for renewing buildings and the major equipment in them. We suggest one change in respect to method. A more important change, however, is required in the amount of funds generated. When the fact is taken into account that major equipment becomes obsolete much faster than the building itself it becomes doubly important to ensure that funds increase to meet rising costs. The net assignable rate per square foot should reflect such changes.

The Southam Construction Index is commonly used for this purpose. The modified figure should be used in calculating the part of the renewal allowance generated by the allocation inventory (1971). The part of the cyclical renewal entitlement derived from actual construction expenditures in the years following 1971 should also be adjusted on the same basis.

As to the method of generating cyclical renewal, our suggestion is that buildings constructed between 1966 and 1971 should qualify for the age/quality discount as do

earlier older buildings in the allocation inventory.

The original decision for excluding these buildings was based on the argument that they were so new that no age quality discount was necessary. However, depreciation is cumulative, and there is no logical reason for denying some form of depreciation allowance for buildings constructed during this period. Cyclical renewal allowance is allowed immediately for buildings built since 1971.

2. *Do you foresee difficulties in adjusting your physical plant to changing student preferences and*
3. *Do you have a policy on the allocation of space amongst faculties, department, administration, etc.*

We do have a policy governing internal space allocation and this policy assists us in making adjustments of the kind referred to in question 2.

Three years ago we recognized the importance of space as a scarce resource and established an Office of Space Allocation reporting to the Vice-Principal Academic. Since then we have created an accurate inventory of rooms, and developed a series of guidelines to be used in planning future space and evaluating our present position. These

guidelines are used to generate space entitlement by department using as input measures equivalent undergraduate students, graduate students, faculty and administrative staff. Annually as part of the budget cycle we conduct a review of all space. This is done by showing for each department actual space and entitlement using the guidelines.

We have clearly recognized that all space belongs to the university and not to individual departments or faculties. We believe this to be an essential prerequisite if we are to maintain some flexibility to respond to changes in a steady state situation. Space is allocated on an annual basis and the review provides a mechanism for accommodating changes in enrolment patterns.

We are not suggesting that every department occupies the same area as generated by the guidelines, neither do we think it practical in most cases to arbitrarily transfer space from one department to another. However comparisons between actual and entitlement are invaluable when considering requests for additional space and help to keep discussions on a more objective basis.

We have found that applying the guidelines to student and staff projections has been helpful in determining where shortages or an excess of space will occur. Also we have used the guidelines successfully in determining how much

space to build in the addition to the geology building and in the Arts and Social Science Complex now nearing completion. The guidelines have helped to introduce more objectivity into the planning process.

The procedures for space allocation outlined above permit a good deal of fluctuation in student preference without major adjustments in space. In other words the space allocated to a department is not fine tuned to enrolments in any particular year. Whether it would become necessary to make major reallocations of space following from major and apparently permanent shifts in student preference would depend on the extent to which the university decides to cater to such shifts. Here considerations of overall balance and making the best use of faculty to whom the university is permanently committed would come into play as important considerations. In some programs enrolments are already strictly limited. Similar limitations may have to be imposed on enrolments in other programs if it appears that the permanent balance of the university is in danger of being shifted to the point where major resources go unused.

Changing student preferences is not the only possible cause of shifts in space usage. Changing styles and methods of instruction could also require capital investment in adapting existing space to area uses. Individualized

instruction requiring round the clock accessibility to technically equipped study carrels is one example which would require such adaptation. Change of this kind if it occurred on a substantial scale might be more costly in the short term and therefore more difficult than many other kinds of reallocation.

SECTION XII. ECONOMIES

1. *In effecting economies, what have been your priorities? What economies have been effected in the level of service of physical plant operations?*

In the Queen's presentation to the Committee on University Affairs in October 1971 we reported fully on the work of the Principal's Committee on Resource Allocation and that document was appended to our presentation for the information of the Committee.* The priorities were set out there in considerable detail. In general our aim has been to allocate funds in a way which would maintain academic quality. We set as an objective the maintenance of fair and competitive rates of compensation for both academic and non-academic staff. Where non-academic staff reductions were required to effect economies this was to be accomplished as far as possible by attrition. A broad indication of the continuing effect of implementing these priorities can be seen in the fact that for the current year the budget for academic salaries has increased six per cent over last year's budget while for other salaries and wages the increase has been 3.5 per cent. When it is remembered that non-academic salary and wage increases (many of

* An extract is included here as Appendix D i.

which are subject to union contracts) has been in the order of 8 - 10 per cent, it is clear that numbers of non-academic staff have been reduced. Staff positions on the library budget have been reduced. While the dollar amounts allocated for the purchase of books and periodicals have been maintained the real purchasing power has been substantially eroded by rising prices. This is one area where there is a great deal of concern about the long term impact on quality unless the resulting cuts on purchases can be restored.

Perhaps the most graphic indicator of the economies effected in physical plant operations is the overall cost per square foot of maintaining plant. This has dropped eight per cent in the last two years over a period when wages have increased 18 per cent and the cost of materials by a similar amount. The frequency of cleaning and the standard of cleanliness have been reduced but present standards of sanitation and appearance are adequate and can be continued without long term adverse effects. Adjustments have also been made in grounds service so that man-power is now used to optimum efficiency at the cost of some delay in carrying out some functions. Other economies have reduced the unnecessary use of electricity and water. Internal mail service has been reduced and additional controls have aimed at achieving greater economy in telephone services.

None of these reductions can be said to present real difficulty if it is necessary to continue them.

On the other hand, reductions which have been made in the preventive maintenance program and interior painting produce what may turn out to be false economics. A full preventive maintenance system ensures more effective and efficient use of mechanical equipment. The effects of reducing the painting schedule may be longer in appearing, but the result eventually is a massive backlog of shabbiness.

The same limits to possible economies apply in the purchase of new equipment for teaching purposes. Renewal of major equipment should be provided for within the cyclical renewal formula. But equipment which wears out more quickly must be replaced from the operating budget. In recent years such replacements have been postponed in favour of the priorities listed. They cannot be postponed any longer and thus provision for covering the full further cost of inflation in the operating income formula is essential.

SECTION XIII. MISCELLANEOUS

1. *To what extent are your facilities available to persons and organizations not directly associated with the university?*

The resources of the university are available to people in the community in several ways: through public events sponsored by the university or member groups of the university: through direct access by individuals, for example to the library; and through reservation of physical facilities by community organizations for their exclusive use. To illustrate these varied uses quantitatively we have listed separately the evening events, conferences held during summer, circulation of books in the Douglas Library, use of athletic facilities and exhibitions at the Agnes Etherington Art Centre.

In our presentation to the Committee on University Affairs, October 1971 (p. 38) we stated that "from May 1970 through April 1971 there were almost 800 concerts, lectures, public meetings of various kinds scheduled on campus after 6:00 p.m. This count does not include any athletic or physical activity events, dances or other purely social occasions. The type of event represented ranges from a Leonard Cohen concert arranged by the Alma Mater Society, through public Dunning Trust Lectures,

theatrical and musical performances, to the annual meeting of the Kingston Symphony Association. Average attendance at these events is estimated at about 140 persons. About ten per cent are sponsored by community groups of various kinds". In the intervening two years the pattern has changed little: Leonard Cohen has been supplanted in popularity, but enthusiastic audiences still attend concerts and the Dunning Trust lectures. Table 1 shows the quantitative estimate of these activities for the period July 1972 to June 1973, and these may be compared to the data for May 1970 to April 1971 in Table 2.

From May to August, the university facilities accommodate externally sponsored conferences, which may be as different as the Students International Meditation Society, the Canadian Textile Seminar and the Canadian Association of Fire Chiefs, and university-related conferences such as the 'Straight Goods' (on environment and pollution) or workshops conducted by the Queen's Industrial Relations Centre. A major event in this category during May and June 1973 was the series of annual meetings of the Learned Societies. The figures for the summer conferences in 1970, 1972, and 1973 are in Table 3.

The university library is open to bona-fide students of all kinds. Typically non-Queen's users might be students from the Royal Military College or St. Lawrence College and

interested members of the public. The resources of the total library system are in general available for borrowing, but we have chosen book circulation in the Douglas Library as an indicator of the relative scale of activity as shown in Table 4. Outside users account for 2.4 per cent of this circulation which may appear to be small when set against nearly 49.1 per cent for undergraduates, but it is quite significant when compared with 5.1 per cent for university staff. The in-library use of 33.8 per cent is spread among all categories of users, including some students from grades XII and XIII.

The demand for sports and athletics facilities in the Kingston community is considerably more than can be met by total resources in the area including those at Queen's. However, every effort is made to make the latter available to outside users once the needs of academic programs and of students and staff at the university have been met. The facilities are made available to the public in two ways: by loan to school and other athletic or recreational organizations and through extension programs sponsored by the School of Physical and Health Education and coached by their staff. A summary of use over the year is shown in Table 5: the swimming pool, the Jock Harty (ice) arena, the gymnasium and the tracks and fields are all used at levels between 150 to 200 hours a year by outside groups,

the pool and arena being rented at a nominal fee and the remainder usually free of charge.

There is no public art gallery in the Kingston region and the Agnes Etherington Art Centre fills a community need which could not otherwise be met. The information in Table 6 lists the public exhibitions held during the year 1972/73 and the estimated attendance during each month. By far the most popular exhibition was 'Heritage Kingston' which opened in June of this year and had attracted over 15,000 visitors by the end of August. It is expected that total attendance at its close in October will have reached 20,000. It has been popular alike with the general public, university students, elementary school children and delegates to the learned societies. The Art Centre sponsors or participates in many other events, but these have been included in the activities discussed earlier.

-1
EVENTING EVENTS - JULY 1, 1972 TO JUNE 30, 1973

E - EVENTS

P - PEOPLE

MONTH	UNIVERSITY			STUDENT			CIVIC & OTHER			TOTAL		
	E	P	P/E	E	P	P/E	E	P	P/E	E	P	P/E
July	5	1670	334	10	960	96	5	240	48	20	2870	144
August	0	1063	118	6	660	110	3	155	52	18	1878	104
September	21	3100	148	36	2475	69	9	935	104	66	6510	99
October	59	11170	190	58	6935	120	12	1050	88	129	19155	148
November	50	6830	137	55	3505	64	12	1170	98	117	11505	98
December	21	3170	150	7	1210	173	6	550	92	34	4930	145
January	42	6450	154	63	7245	735	11	2765	533	116	16460	141
February	45	4950	110	46	4550	99	12	765	64	103	10265	100
March	35	3150	90	34	4305	127	11	665	60	80	8120	102
April	27	2650	98	11	1900	173	11	885	80	49	5435	111
May	10	7835	784	4	300	75	7	536	77	21	8671	413
June	5	3250	650	5	330	66	2	75	37	12	3655	305
TOTAL	320	55288	168	335	34375	103	101	9791	97	765	90454	130

1. Occasional and cultural events after 6 p.m., excluding social (e.g. dances), athletic (all physical activities) and small groups.
2. University sponsored
3. A.M.S. and affiliated.
4. City and university related

EVENING EVENTS - MAY, 1970 to APRIL, 1971

⁻¹
E - EVENTS

P - PEOPLE

MONTH	UNIVERSITY ⁻²			STUDENT ⁻³			CIVIC & OTHER ⁻⁴			TOTAL		
	E	P	P/E	E	P	P/E	E	P	P/E	E	P	P/E
May	6	900	150		nil		5	700	140	11	1600	145
June	6	900	150	6	1200	200	1	300	300	13	2400	100
July	5	550	110	9	1700	190		nil		14	2250	160
August	11	1700	155	1	100	100	1	500	500	13	2300	175
September	15	1500	100	28	4110	150	2	300	150	45	5910	130
October	69	9800	140	68	11250	165	25	3530	140	162	24580	150
November	66	9850	150	73	8100	110	8	860	110	147	18810	140
December	8	840	105	17	3720	220	5	430	86	30	4990	165
January	15	2430	160	45	3540	80	8	530	65	68	6500	95
February	50	6500	130	53	9100	170	11	2810	260	114	18410	160
March	55	8100	150	38	5700	150	8	580	70	101	14380	140
April	43	4450	105	8	1600	200	7	850	120	58	6000	120
Total	340	47520	135	346	50120	145	81	11300	165	776	109030	140

1. Occasional and cultural events after 6 p.m., excluding social (e.g. dances), athletic (all physical activities) and small groups.

2. University sponsored

3. A.M.S. and affiliated.

4. City and university related.

- 83 -
TABLE 3
CONFERENCES

TYPE	E - EVENTS			PD - PEOPLE			DAYS			P/E - PEOPLE/EVENT		
	MAY			JUNE			JULY			AUGUST		
	E	PD	P/E	E	PD	P/E	E	PD	P/E	E	PD	P/E
SUMMER ACTIVITY - 1970												
Externally sponsored conferences	6	3430	100	8	4090	90	nil			4	3760	260
University related conferences	7	3700	400	5	1090	200	nil			1	2100	150
SUMMER ACTIVITY - 1972												
Externally sponsored conferences	9	2518	140	5	413	46	4	28588	502	10	3534	53
University Related conferences	13	1977	37	4	1110	29	nil			5	905	91
SUMMER ACTIVITY - 1973												
Externally sponsored Conferences	18	4484	140	27	5011	96	5	517	35	14	5267	150
University Related conferences	6	3535	75	7	1176	40	nil			4	900	82
Learned Societies	15	7160	170	30	12112	150						

TABLE 4

Re: Monthly Circulation Statistics,
 July 1972 to June 1973 -- Main Circulation
 Desk and Reserve Desk, Douglas Library

	<u>Under- graduates</u>	<u>Graduate students</u>	<u>Staff</u>	<u>Others</u>	<u>In-library use</u>	<u>Total</u>
Jul '72	10,750	2,828	1,587	326	6,094	21,585
Aug '72	4,166	2,459	1,939	291	4,857	13,712
Sep '72	8,086	3,230	2,103	271	4,620	18,310
Oct '72	28,610	4,754	2,337	493	10,751	55,945
Nov '72	34,722	4,931	2,088	561	18,806	61,111
Dec '72	17,077	2,925	1,759	384	10,610	32,755
Jan '73	24,070	4,604	2,283	558	15,885	47,400
Feb '73	30,593	4,390	1,970	1,866	18,775	57,594
Mar '73	40,942	5,374	2,414	2,510	26,156	77,396
Apr '73	26,739	4,046	1,942	1,130	24,043	58,809
May '73	4,176	2,753	2,080	1,491	7,725	18,225
Jun '73	3,968	2,552	1,824	1,722	3,032	13,008
<u>Grand total</u>	233,899	44,846	24,326	11,615	161,254	475,940
<u>Percentage of total use</u>	49.1%	9.4%	5.1%	2.4%	33.8%	

Note: Circulation in the Douglas Library is chosen as a reliable indicator of activity in the total library system. The figures are not to be interpreted as a measure of 'total library activity', but rather as pattern of usage.

TABLE 5

PHYSICAL EDUCATION CENTRE
SUMMARY OF USAGE

July 1, 1972 - June 30, 1973: Hours of use

<u>Facility</u>	<u>Outside Groups</u>	<u>Extension Programs</u>	<u>Total</u>
Swimming Pool	175	454	629
Jock Harty Arena	107	-	107
Gymnasium	171	190	361
Tennis Courts	77	200	277
Projectile Range	48	25	73
Track (indoor)	176	-	176
West Campus Track and Field	167	120	287
Totals	921	980	1910

TABLE 6

EXHIBITIONS AT AGNES ETHERINGTON ART CENTRE

1972/73

<u>MONTH</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>ESTIMATED ATTENDANCE</u>
July	Ernest Lindner Drawings	1,400
August	Selections from permanent collection	850
September	Walter Sawron - 'Realism: Emulsion & Omission'	3,500
October	Walter Sawron - 'Realism: Emulsion & Omission' German Expressionist Prints	2,300
November	'Ready-Mades' by Marcel Duchamp Kingston woodcuts by Gwyneth Travers	1,800
December	Progress in Conservation Selections from permanent collection	600
January	Lichtenstein and Johns Colette Whiten	1,700
February	Early Canadian Paintings Kurt Kranz	2,750
March	Kurt Kranz Four Kingston Photographers Two Kingston Artists: Trevor Hodgson and Robert van der Peer	2,200
April	Paris Today	1,650
May	Closed for installation of 'Heritage Kingston'	
June	Heritage Kingston	9,500

Note: More than 15,000 people had visited 'Heritage Kingston' by the end of August and it is expected that total attendance at the exhibition will have reached 20,000 at its close in October.

2. *What are your views on the proposed metanet computer network?*

It is our view that in the long run the needs of computer users at Queen's can probably best be served by a system which provides access at reasonable cost to the facilities available throughout the university system. No university can afford to provide a full range of computer services in house. It makes sense therefore to ensure that as wide a variety of services as possible is available within the Ontario system while at the same time of course ensuring that overall capacity is sufficient to meet the total needs of the system. At Queen's we have some capacity which is at present unique within the system and we look forward to sharing this on a reciprocal basis. We do not believe that computing for teaching, administration, or research should be a free good within the university system. At Queen's we have been moving for the past three years towards complete accounting of all resources used for computing. We believe that this is a sound principle to be applied in designing any co-operative sharing arrangements.

As the Committee knows, a task force has been appointed by the Council of Ontario Universities to inquire into the administrative machinery needed to support a workable

sharing system. We look forward to discussing the problems involved with the task force and assisting them in reaching a positive conclusion.

3. *What are your views on university library coordination?*

It is our view that university library coordination will have to be developed to provide a full bibliographic system in Ontario if the needs of Queen's and other universities are to be met. Although our own collection passed the one-million-volume mark in 1973, thus doubling the collection in the past seven years, we have not been able to purchase even the essential volumes from the enormous and increasing output of the world publishing industry. Even a fully coordinated Ontario system cannot be expected to be entirely self-sufficient in today's world. (Over half of the 62,000 interlibrary loan requests made by Ontario universities in 1971/72, had to be met from library resources outside Ontario).

The Queen's Senate in May 1973 approved in principle a proposal for the establishment of a cooperative library system for the Ontario universities as set out in a report from the Board for Library Coordination established by the Council of Ontario Universities. One major objective of

the proposal -- a coordination of the collection policies of the universities -- will depend on speedy, accurate, and up-to-date information about the holdings of each member library in the system. Therefore, priority is now given to a pilot project which, if successful, will lead to the development of a computer-based union catalogue for the Ontario university libraries. This will not only provide improved access to the resources of the system for students and faculty alike; it will also make possible the development of rational collection policies which will ensure that the money available for book purchases is not wasted in unnecessary duplication within the system. While Queen's was not selected as a full participant in the pilot project, it is an active and interested observer. We believe it is of the utmost importance that the pilot project be carried through an adequate trial and evaluation, with the resulting data fully publicized. While we hope that the results will be favourable and will lead to the development of the union catalogue, we think it most important that a conclusion, favourable or unfavourable, be reached.

We perhaps should emphasize two points. First, the effective coordination of collection policies will be made possible. Such coordination will in turn lead to some reallocation of resources available for purchases --

a fruitful result for all of the libraries in Ontario. But we should also note that while some cost savings are potentially involved in the project, we do not consider that the success or failure depends on demonstration of large reductions in present overall library expenditures. Obviously it will not be possible to proceed with a union catalogue if the additional costs involved are very large. On the other hand, if such a catalogue enables us to hold expenditures for processing at something like their present levels or even trim them somewhat, resources will be freed to provide better overall service.

Second, we want to emphasize our view that a coordinated system does not mean a fully centralized system. A university library is, in many ways, a vital force, the hub of scholarship in its particular institution. It is essential, therefore, for a university library to be responsive to the constituency which it exists primarily to serve, and to be sensitive to their needs. In approving the Board proposal for the coordination of collection policies we emphasized the need for the initiative in developing policy to remain with each university and for the closest collaboration and cooperation of the libraries, departments and faculties within the universities in the first instance. Building confidence in the virtues and benefits of a coordinated system will take time. It is worth taking

time at each stage to convince and demonstrate to the individual constituency that it will be better served under the new arrangements than under the old.

Other cooperative projects which will contribute to the objectives of overall coordination are under way. We have been a major participant in the documents project along with the University of Guelph and five other universities. We look forward to assessing in due course the possible benefits of association with the serials, maps and subject authority projects.

We are also considering the possibility of depository storage facilities, perhaps on a cooperative basis with universities in the Ottawa area. Policies governing selection of books for such storage, and ready access to them, present considerable difficulties; but we know that we must consider this or alternative solutions before a shortage of stock space on this campus becomes critical in three years' time.

Our interest in library coordination both on a province-wide and on a national scale has been long and sustained. This interest continues. The Queen's University Libraries are a major resource, one of three libraries in Ontario having over one million volumes, drawn upon by many smaller libraries both academic and public, and drawing in turn upon resources both Canada-wide and

international. This interdependence requires the development of strong, dependable bibliographic systems for the best exploitation of resources, and the widest acceptance of the principle of access to all information for all serious users. To obtain these ends, within the reasonable provision of funds, will require coordination of library operational systems and policies for development, and adequate, constant intercommunication.

4. *Do you have formal grievance procedures available for staff and students?*

Yes. *The Senate Statement on Grievance, Discipline and Related Matters* as approved by the Board of Trustees and the Senate in April, 1972 follows as Appendix B i.

LONG TERM ENROLMENT DATA 1971-1972 TO 1978-1979

INSTRUCTIONS:

1. Please complete this report in a manner consistent with the enrolment categorization scheme and definitions reflected on the regular MCU Enrolment Report (UAR Forms). Note particularly, however, the precise requirement under item 'a' which is for registration in the 1st. University Year subsequent to Grade 13 into undergraduate degree programs only.
2. Reports for the University of Guelph, the University of Waterloo, and the University of Windsor should be on an FTE basis.
3. For constituent Universities with Federated or Affiliated institutions, Full-Time Enrolment must take into account FTE teaching service performed for these institutions, and will therefore, be stated in terms of FTE for teaching services performed (Toronto, Waterloo, Western and Laurentian).

	1971 -72	1972 -73	1973 -74	1974 -75	1975 -76	1976 -77	1977 -78	1978 -79
a. Full-Time "Freshman Intake" (i.e. 1st Year Undergraduate Degree)	1,944	2,034	2,175	2,025	2,025	2,025	2,025	2,025
b. Total Full-Time Undergraduate (including diploma and other non-degree and make-up or qualifying year)	7,664	7,972	8,325	8,355	8,585	8,690	8,780	8,780
c. Total Graduate (Fall-Term)	937	904	950	1,020	1,110	1,205	1,265	1,265
d. Total Full-Time Enrolment (b) plus (c)	8,601	8,876	9,275	9,375	9,605	9,895	10,045	10,045
e. FTE of Part-Time Enrolment using appropriate Formula Conversion Factors (excluding "Summer School" Graduate Students)	1,189	1,339	1,425	1,483	1,463	1,483	1,483	1,483
f. FTE Enrolment (d plus e)	9,790	10,215	10,700	10,858	11,175	11,378	11,528	11,528

Estimated
for
1 Dec. 73

Actual
Projections based on SGRAD 74
(January 1973)

UNDERGRADUATE ENROLMENT DATA

DEGREES AWARDED BY LEVEL

	1971-1972 <u>ACTUAL</u>	1972-1973 <u>ACTUAL</u>	1973-1974 <u>ESTIMATED</u>	1974-1975 <u>PROJECTED</u>	1975-1976 <u>PROJECTED</u>	1976-1977 <u>PROJECTED</u>	1977-1978 <u>PROJECTED</u>	1978-1979 <u>PROJECTED</u>
--	----------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------

GENERAL DEGREE

B.A.

HONS. DEGREE

B.A.

B.Sc.

FIRST PROF. DEGREE

B.Sc. (Engineering)

BPHE

B.Com.

B.N. Sc. (Nursing)

B. Education

L.T. B.

M.D.

B. Sc. (Rehabilitation)

TOTAL DEGREES

750	713	750	750	750	750	750	750	750
247	245	250	270	270	270	270	270	270
132	133	145	200	220	230	230	230	230
277	318	265	290	280	290	300	310	310
44	44	44	55	55	55	55	55	55
111	101	130	160	170	160	140	140	140
8	25	35	45	45	50	50	50	50
590	680	700	750	900	900	900	900	900
113	126	128	130	130	130	130	130	130
59	70	72	70	70	70	70	70	70
2	15	21	30	30	32	40	40	40
2,335	2,470	2,538	2,742	2,920	2,937	2,935	2,940	2,940

UNDERGRADUATE ENROLLMENT DATADEGREES AWARDED BY LEVEL

<u>DIPLOMA</u>	<u>1971-1972 ACTUAL</u>	<u>1972-1973 ESTIMATED</u>	<u>1973-1974 ESTIMATED</u>	<u>1974-1975 PROJECTED</u>	<u>1975-1976 PROJECTED</u>	<u>1976-1977 PROJECTED</u>	<u>1977-1978 PROJECTED</u>	<u>1978-1979 PROJECTED</u>
Rehabilitation Therapy	30	20	35	-	-	-	-	-

(Specify)

Rehabilitation Therapy

		GRADUATE DIPLOMAS AND DEGREES AWARDED / TO BE AWARDED BY DISCIPLINE AREA						
		1971-1972 ACTUAL	1972-1973 ACTUAL	1973-1974 ESTIMATED	1974-1975 PROJECTED	1975-1976 PROJECTED	1976-1977 PROJECTED	1977-1978 PROJECTED
<u>AGGREGATE FIGURES</u>								
Master's	274	280	284	332	362	386	405	405
Doctoral	82	84	81	86	90	102	120	120
Other (Specify)	356	364	365	418	452	488	525	525
Total	356	364	365	418	452	488	525	525
<u>FIGURES BY DISCIPLINE AREA</u>								
<u>EDUCATION</u>								
Master's	16	20	27	35	40	40	40	40
Doctoral								
Other (Specify)								
Total	16	20	27	35	40	40	40	40
<u>FINE AND APPLIED ARTS</u>								
Master's								
Doctoral								
Other (Specify)								
Total								
Master's	4	6	6	10	10	10	10	10
Doctoral								
Other (Specify)								
Total	4	6	6	10	10	10	10	10
<u>HUMANITIES AND RELATED</u>								
Master's	44	51	50	50	50	50	50	50
Doctoral	10	18	15	15	15	15	15	15
Other (Specify)	54	69	65	65	65	65	65	65
Total	108	134	130	140	140	147	155	155
<u>SOCIAL SCIENCES AND RELATED</u>								
Master's	120	126	120	140	140	147	155	155
Doctoral	12	8	15	20	24	28	35	35
Other (Specify)	132	134	135	160	164	175	190	190
Total	132	134	135	160	164	175	190	190

GRADUATE ENROLLMENT DATA

		GRADUATE DIPLOMAS AND DEGREES AWARDED / TO BE AWARDED BY DISCIPLINE AREA							
		1971-1972	1972-1973	1973-1974	1974-1975	1975-1976	1976-1977	1977-1978	1978-1979
		ACTUAL	ACTUAL	ESTIMATED	PROJECTED	PROJECTED	PROJECTED	PROJECTED	PROJECTED
<u>AGRICULTURAL AND BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES</u>									
Master's	9	6	14	15	25	30	35	35	35
Doctoral	11	5	6	5	5	10	15	15	15
Other (Specify)									
Total	20	11	20	30	40	50	50	50	50
<u>ENGINEERING AND APPLIED SCIENCES</u>									
Master's	51	35	40	45	45	48	50	50	50
Doctoral	13	18	10	10	10	12	15	15	15
Other (Specify)									
Total	64	53	50	55	55	60	65	65	65
<u>HEALTH PROFESSIONS AND OCCUPATIONS</u>									
Master's	18	12	10	15	18	20	20	20	20
Doctoral	7	5	5	6	6	7	10	10	10
Other (Specify)									
Total	25	17	15	21	24	27	30	30	30
<u>MATHEMATICS AND THE PHYSICAL SCIENCES</u>									
Master's	32	34	30	40	45	45	45	45	45
Doctoral	29	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
Other (Specify)									
Total	61	60	75	75	75	75	75	75	75

Form CUA-D-73

Pages 98 to 101

to be submitted later

CUA RESPONSE

Appendices

A SCAD Report #5

To be received by the Senate October 25, 1973

B Senate Documents on

- i Discipline, Grievance and Related Matters
- ii Tenure
- iii Academic Leave
- iv The University Appointment: Freedom and Responsibility

C Revised ACAP Preamble

D Extracts from

- i Report of the Principal's Committee on Resource Allocation
- ii SCAD #4 - University/Government Interface for Planning

Appendix A

ACADEMIC DEVELOPMENT AT QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY, REPORT #5

I INTRODUCTION

These annual reports of the Committee on Academic Development to the Senate, of which this is the fifth, provide the basis for long-term planning at Queen's. We have emphasized each year that such planning is a continuing, dynamic process which involves reevaluation and readjustment of assumptions and objectives regularly each year. Adjustments are made through wide consultation, informal as well as formal, among the major constituencies within the university. The Senate, which is representative of these constituencies, has the responsibility of overseeing and validating this long-term academic planning process for the university as a whole.

A major part of "the plan" (assuming that anything so subject to change deserves the name) is expressed in the enrolment projections which are updated each January and, following approval by the Senate, included in the printed version of the reports.

As well as setting out the intentions of the university in the enrolment projections, it is a function of these reports to provide "early warning" of policy matters which will require thought and discussion well ahead of the time when decision will be required if foreseeable problems are to be dealt with on a carefully considered basis. In other

words, these planning documents are concerned with ensuring constructive and positive response to changing circumstances.

Many topics have been discussed in previous reports under the general heading of change. This year we return to several which seem especially to require attention: admissions and the related policy areas of continuing education and scholarships and student aid. We shall also bring up to date earlier discussions of research policy and curricular innovation.

Action on these matters will be initiated in the Boards and Committees of the various Faculties at Queen's, by the Council of Ontario Universities and its subsidiary bodies and the Committee on University Affairs. It is the hope of the Senate Committee that the overview of these topics presented here will provide useful background and guidance for deliberation and decision elsewhere.

II ADMISSIONS POLICY AND RELATED MATTERS

Among the many factors that shape a university, two are basic: the kinds of people that seek entrance and the bases on which the university admits and retains them. Through the sixties, most first year university candidates in Ontario had followed one of two well-defined paths: a continuous sequence of full-time study following grade XIII or a pattern

of part-time enrolment followed by such full-time attendance as was required to satisfy degree regulations. Furthermore, the numbers in each category had been sufficiently assured as to cause little anxiety in Ontario universities. As a result, the universities had been able to wear lightly the burden of expectations entertained by prospective students, and had not felt obliged to modify their admissions policies except to provide more flexibility for part-time studies and to innovate cautiously with programs for students starting with some sort of disadvantage.

Of course it should be remembered that the admissions picture in the sixties was probably tidier than it had ever been. Until comparatively recent times most universities in Ontario offered a preliminary year which was competitive with high school grade XIII. And indeed for many years grade XIII had not been available in many parts of the province. But the preliminary year offered an opportunity to the socially mature but academically less advanced student to cover grade XIII material in a university setting. The university, of course, cost money and therefore the preliminary year was in those days more accessible to those who could finance an extra year of university living. Queen's abolished the preliminary year in 1945 and required completion of five subjects at grade XIII level for admission. By the middle 50's most other Ontario universities had followed suit. The

preliminary year, however, has never died out entirely. There were 754 preliminary year students in three universities in 1972/73. These numbers do not include the students admitted from grade XII at Brock who constitute about half of their freshmen enrolment, which totals about 800. Whatever the history may have been we seem to be returning to a less "tidy" state of affairs. If so we are not alone -- witness these observations from the president of a noted Maritime university. "A matter of growing concern is the inconsistency in levels of admission and in length of degree programmes in Canadian universities. Even in the Maritimes there are marked and troubling differences. Some universities admit from Nova Scotia grade XI, some from grade XII. Some admit New Brunswick grade XII graduates to a three-year B.A. programme, some, including all the New Brunswick universities, to a four-year programme. This confusion has potentially serious consequences both for some universities and for some students. What to do about it is a question being debated among and within the universities - and we have a Committee wrestling with the problem."* Yet it remains hard to believe that we are not moving towards more flexibility in admissions and therefore in programs at the university level if we are to serve the increasingly varied demands of able students

* Mount Allison University, President's Report 1971-72 p. 5.

whose experience does not conform to the more settled pattern of the sixties.

A major theme of the report of the Commission on Post-Secondary Education in Ontario is that dramatic changes can be expected within the decade in the patterns of university attendance. The phenomena of diminishing university participation from grade XIII and the university 'stop-out' may be first signs of changes. Whether or not they are such, the implications of stable or declining enrolments in universities cannot be ignored. At the very least, it is prudent to begin examination of the complex set of questions that relate to future admissions policies at Queen's: what kinds of students may we expect to seek admission in the future? Which of these should we accept and on what basis? To what extent should we diverge from provincial or national trends? Will we be unique because we want to be or because we will be constrained by our geographic location? What real choices exist?

While the plan of a constant enrolment of 10,000 at Queen's was being developed and adopted in the years 1969 and 1970 provincial enrolments were expected to rise throughout the coming decade, and it appeared then that significant distinctions between Queen's and other provincial universities would follow our divergence from the provincial trends. This has not now happened: the system as a whole has gone into a premature and unplanned 'steady state' and we must be prepared

for dislocations which will affect us and which will be large precisely because most other universities in the system had not yet planned for level enrolments. This does not imply that we need abandon our adopted plan but it does suggest that we should question how we are to get there in the light of new circumstances.

Such questioning, in turn does not necessarily lead to "lowering standards" in order to achieve enrolment targets. It is settled policy at Queen's that we wish to direct our efforts, supported by public funds, towards the instruction of students who are capable of benefiting from the experience which Queen's can provide, and who wish to do so. This is to be a university experience - not extended high school experience, not a trade-school experience, but a university experience with all that that implies of the study of basic concepts, of reasoning from first principles, of analysis and synthesis, of independent, literate study and self discipline. Nevertheless new circumstances are likely to create problems for Queen's in deciding first, how to choose those students who have the capacity for university work of this kind, and second, how far to vary the content and method of instruction offered to meet the special needs of students with different kinds of previous experience.

These various circumstances will be reviewed briefly and then discussed at greater length as we look at alternative

responses to them. First, as already mentioned there has been a sharp decline in the proportion of secondary school students going on to university. Even if the decline ceases, we can no longer expect large increases in the numbers of new students entering university each year from the high schools. This situation has led to more intensive competition among universities in recruiting students.

Second, the diversity of choices in high school subjects and the absence of a uniform standard in the province are making selection criteria increasingly uncertain. SACU tests are no longer required in any Ontario university. The preparation of students for entry into a particular university program can no longer be accurately judged. Furthermore, under the new High School curriculum students are no longer required to take either English or Mathematics even to the grade XII level. Unless the trend is reversed, or unless the universities decide to require minimum competence in these subjects for admission (the only program at Queen's still requiring both is Commerce) increasing numbers of illiterate and innumerate students with the required capacity for university work will present themselves for admission. Third, the adoption by high schools of curricula based on credits and of organization by semester are already resulting in numbers of students seeking admission to university at the end of January. Fourth, the future of grade XIII is in doubt and the possible admission

of large numbers of students from grade XII following the example of Brock University has to be contemplated. Fifth, an increasing number of students are wishing to transfer from CAATS either during or upon completion of their programs. Sixth is the service provided by the Ontario Universities Applications Centre, which has helped smooth an otherwise confused and fiercely competitive situation. It is mentioned here because of the possible benefits from extending its service to include transfers between institutions and entry to professional programs which do not admit directly from high schools. Seventh, there is increased demand for part-time university work outside of conventional patterns of evening classes, summer school and correspondence courses. Eighth, there is increased concern about providing opportunities for university work to groups in society, including women, which have been under-represented in the past.

Finally there is a noticeable tendency in very recent years for students to choose professional programs or programs with good job prospects and a simultaneous reduction of interest in general education. Resulting pressures on certain sectors of the university have created unnecessarily high academic requirements for admission to some programs where perhaps other personal factors may be equally important to successful professional performance.

As a university we must decide how to respond to these changing circumstances. We therefore turn now to several general areas of uncertainty. We shall examine some of the responses already being tested at Queen's as well as others which may deserve consideration. We shall also touch on the subjects of student aid and continuing education which have an important bearing on admissions policy.

Uneveness of high school preparation

There are several policy options at least theoretically available.

- A. Use existing criteria. Grade XI, grade XII and grade XIII (midterm) marks and principal's reports - accept the fact that increasing numbers of students in mathematics and science courses will fail in the first year because of inadequate preparation.
- B. Accept students using existing criteria, but test early in the year for levels of preparation and offer opportunities for remedial work perhaps allowing some reduction in normal workload (to be made up later) or transfer into specially designed course sequences extending beyond the normal academic year, into the spring or summer sessions. The total university level work required for degree purposes would, of course, remain the same.

C. Administer tests of levels of preparation as part of the admissions process and reject those students who do not show required levels of competence. Insist that remedial opportunities be provided in other institutions.

Option A would be feasible if first year admissions are increased to allow for a higher rate of attrition thus ensuring adequate enrolments in second year and beyond. On the other hand such a calculated increase in first year "wastage" would be considered by many to be potentially wasteful of student talent and university resources.

Option C assumes that elementary work in any subject already taught in high schools is not the responsibility of the university. Apart from other possible objections to this stance, the administrative difficulties appear to be insurmountable. It would not be fair to test student knowledge before the end of the grade XIII year and testing in June would mean abandonment or severe modification of the system of early confirmed admissions which is now securely in place and working well as the normal mode of admission. Furthermore to insist that remedial opportunities be provided elsewhere for students who fail one or more of the tests is to postpone university entrance for these students for perhaps a year. Moreover, where are such opportunities

to be provided? In the high schools? This would mean recentralizing control of the high school curriculum. In the CAATS? Is it any more the proper job of the CAATS to prepare students for university level work than for the universities to do this themselves? There is perhaps a strong case for reinforcing central control on the content of grade XIII courses in some subjects. But such a reversal would take time to implement. Meanwhile, has the university any real option but to accept the best students on the basis of available evidence and correct deficiencies in preparation as appropriate in each subject?

Indeed the Faculty of Applied Science at Queen's has already chosen to implement option B in the present academic year. Arrangements have been made with the departments of Physics, Chemistry, and Mathematics to provide extended first year courses for students who show inadequate preparation in tests taken immediately following registration. Students who fail in these subjects at Christmas may join the extended sequence of courses in the New Year and students in the main stream who fail final examinations in April may join the last phase of the extended course sequence for the final eight weeks in the spring term and try the examinations again. Thus one pattern of remedial work is to be tested at Queen's in the current year.

There are other possible patterns. Remedial tutorials

can be conducted concurrently with the regular courses, but there is no doubt that this method imposes heavy burdens on the students involved. Additional teaching burdens involved may be heavier as well under these circumstances.

Still other patterns are to be found in the developing field of self-instructional techniques. These are widely misinterpreted as implying the removal of the student from face to face contact with professors and tutors. In fact, all that is implied is that such courses depend very little, if at all, on conventional lectures. Study materials are made available to students in self-contained units which each student can assimilate at his own pace. In such a system it is possible to insert remedial units wherever these are required by an individual student. Each student has regular contact with a tutor and seminars and laboratory exercises may be scheduled on a regular basis. Students must complete and be tested on each unit before progressing to the next. Because the preparation of such self-instructional materials is expensive, there is much to be said for their co-operative development and for a university such as Queen's making use of materials developed elsewhere in designing its own courses in the same way that text books are used in conventional lecture courses. The University of Toronto now uses these methods exclusively for first year courses in biology and psychology. McGill has developed this approach in more

than thirty courses in some twenty subjects. No claim is made here that self-instruction necessarily produces better results than conventional methods. Nor, of course, does it necessarily reduce the professional effort involved in teaching although it may redeploy this to the advantage of both students and teacher.

A main advantage of self-instruction is that it can permit students with widely varying backgrounds to proceed successfully through the same course. It may also make it easier to offer certain kinds of first year programs at reasonable cost to students who wish to begin in January, without revising the regular curriculum. Self-instruction techniques can offer flexibility in scheduling as well as in pacing study to suit individual needs. As the need grows to provide more such flexible opportunities, the modular, self-instruction approach, backed by adequate tutorial and counselling services may offer the most practical and economic methods of offering first year instruction in some subjects. Interest in diagnostic tests and remedial methods is widespread in Ontario universities and a considerable variety of experience is available to those at Queen's who must consider the best way to approach these matters here.

Programs for which the number of applicants is always
much greater than total places in the Ontario system

At Queen's the decision to limit overall growth within a ceiling of 10,000 full time students was taken more than four years ago. Since then, except for applied science and more recently education, demand for admission to all undergraduate and professional programs has greatly exceeded the number of available places. First choice applications for arts and science and commerce have consistently exceeded the targets for first year admissions. However, in the Ontario system, taken as a whole, qualified students not admitted to Queen's could be certain of finding places elsewhere.

In the past two years, a larger proportion of students has been seeking entrance to professional programs where job prospects appear to the student to be more certain. Admission to such programs is limited, particularly in the health sciences, by available clinical resources. Demand for admission has always exceeded the supply of places, not just at Queen's, but throughout the province and the country. The traditional case is medicine. But the stronger current interest in most other professional programs as well as medicine has created quite unprecedented pressure on programs at Queen's. For example, there were 500 applicants for 20 places in physical therapy and 250

for 20 places in occupational therapy. Few such applicants not admitted to Queen's will find places elsewhere in the province. The situation is comparable in medicine with 1,400 applications for 70 first year places (half filled with students who have completed two years of university, the rest with first degrees in another faculty). In law, where admission requires a minimum of two years' university, the pressure of demand is also intense and growing with 2,200 applications for 145 first year places.

Except for medicine where a 50 per cent expansion of places at Queen's was for a short time thought to be possible if adequate resources had been made available, the expansion of professional programs beyond presently planned limits has not been contemplated. Whether government policy will encourage the expansion of parallel programs in other universities or support the development of new programs in order to accommodate student demand remains to be seen. For purposes of our own planning, however, we must assume continued intense pressure on these programs and consider our admissions procedures and policies accordingly.

A review of procedures followed for admission to these programs will indicate some of the available policy options.

- A. Rely on academic record (grade XIII or university) accepting candidates off the top, with use of letters of recommendation where candidates seem to be equal academically. Mainly objective.
- B. Rely on academic record -- supplemented with interviews and/or written statement (auto-biographical, or "why I want to be a . . ."). Combine objective and subjective judgement.
- C. Rely on academic record together with special test designed to indicate aptitude for professional practice. Objective.
- D. Rely on academic record combined with a scoring system which weighs other personal factors -- leadership in extra curricular activities, work experience etc. Subjective/objective.

The Faculty of Law has been basing admission on option "C" with the use of the Law School Admission Test. This combination has proven to be a good predictor of success in the law degree program. While the academic record is still the primary factor in the selection process, the Law School Admissions test provides significant information about an applicant's aptitude for the study of law.

Both parts of the School of Rehabilitation Medicine would very much like to find a battery of tests which would reliably predict aptitude for the programs in Occupational and Physical Therapy. The School is dissatisfied with present reliance on academic record, but experiments with interviews and written submissions from applicants as described in option B have not been successful. The Faculty of Medicine uses methods described in option D. It is a more complex system than most and depends heavily on the assumptions of the persons scoring the non-academic qualities of candidates. There is no evidence yet to indicate that this method of selection produces more successful students than would an off-the-top selection based on academic record alone. In any case, its use where large numbers of applicants are involved would divert a disproportionate effort from teaching to selection.

Option E. There is a fifth possibility, not employed at Queen's or elsewhere in Ontario, but increasingly discussed as being the fairest method of selection of a very limited number of students from a very large pool of qualified candidates -- the lottery. The lottery principle can be applied in various ways. Outstanding candidates clearly superior in potential to all others can be admitted in advance. The pool from which

remaining candidates are drawn can be large or small. A major difficulty is that deciding who is included in the eligible pool is still an arbitrary matter. The question remains: is it more arbitrary than present methods which may admit a student with academic record X and reject a student with academic record X-1?

Assuring the best possible aggregate of success for those admitted to the programs is only part of the problem - at least with health sciences where qualified manpower is at a premium. There is also legitimate concern about subsequent performance in the profession. Although legitimacy of such concern cannot be in doubt, the possibility of effectively basing admissions on significant statistical probabilities is very much in doubt. At a time when equality of opportunity is the dominant theme of public policy in education, the possibility that the lottery offers as fair and effective method of selection as any appears to merit close examination in those programs where no reliable tests of aptitude for performance exist. Many would insist, however, that the solution lies not in the lottery, but in discovering and using the necessary tests. They would argue moreover that the use of a lottery might depress the morale of an institution based on the idea of a rational choice. Many would share Einstein's reaction to Heisenberg's Uncertainty

Principle: "God does not play dice with the world".

Under-represented groups

There are identifiable groups in society which have been, until now, under-represented in all universities including Queen's. Such under-representation is a symptom of the failure of our political and social system to provide equal opportunities of other kinds over long periods of time. This is not the place to attempt analysis, of course, but to ask rather what responsibility the university should accept for providing remedies. Once more, we are talking only about individuals in these groups who have the intellectual capacity to benefit from university work.

Under-represented groups can be placed in three categories which obviously can and do overlap: ethnic groups (in particular Indians and Eskimos), poor people, and women.

On the recommendation of the Council Committee on Admissions the age for admission of mature students (those who, frequently for economic reasons, have not completed high school) has been lowered to 21. The Faculty of Arts and Science is testing in 1973-4 an experimental program under which 50 students who dropped out of high school after grade X and are between the ages of 18 and 21 have

been admitted to first year. They have been selected after careful consideration of ability, achievement and motivation and their performance will be carefully monitored so that lessons may be learned for future application in admitting special students of this kind. It is hoped that significant information will also be gained which will be useful in the regular admission process. Obviously the matter of remedial work is especially pertinent to the admissions of such special students. The Dean of Arts and Science also established a year ago a Committee on Native Studies, Service and Research. It is clear that special university initiatives to increase the enrolment of native peoples must have the support of the bodies representing the interests of these peoples. Paternalism or its appearance is to be avoided. From the Committee's discussion with such bodies it is apparent that native peoples hold ambivalent opinions about the role of universities. They wish to see more Indian and Eskimo students and faculty in universities. On the other hand the university as a non-native institution is distrusted as, by definition, being incapable of meeting native needs. Much will depend on government action. If policy control of education is placed in the hands of native peoples themselves and adequately funded then the university may be able

to respond with special admission programs which have the full support of the people they are intended to serve. The Faculty of Law has been concerned that some elements in society are under-represented in the legal profession and has set aside 12 places for students from these groups (e.g. native peoples and ethnic minorities).

The representation of women among university students has increased markedly in recent years in the Faculty of Arts and Science. There is proportionately a larger number of women in that Faculty than in the general population. In all other programs except nursing, rehabilitation medicine and physical and health education, the proportion is less. Again, we need not attempt to analyse the reasons for this here. The Principal's Committee on the Status of Women at Queen's has spent the past year probing admissions as well as other matters relevant to their terms of reference and will shortly make their report. In the meantime we note only that, after a special program designed to inform women graduates at Queen's about opportunities for women in today's business world, enrolment of women in the first year of the M.B.A. program has jumped to 18 in 1973 from 1 in 1972.

Continuing Education

In its final report the Commission on Post Secondary

Education in Ontario again emphasized the need for expanded opportunities for learning of all kinds throughout life. So far as university degree work is concerned Queen's has traditionally offered opportunities for part-time studies through its extramural programs in Arts and Science and increasingly through courses offered in the evenings in the Kingston area. Spring term (intersession) courses have been available for two years in addition to regular summer school which has been offering courses on campus for more than sixty years. Obviously, the Commission has been right to stress the development of other kinds of opportunities to meet the new needs of changing society e.g. opportunities for learning while working and opportunities for full time study in periods of varying length intercepting normal employment.

We pointed out in Report #3 and again last year, that Queen's can and should meet reasonable demands for new patterns of part-time study. Experience to date, however, suggests that given our geographical situation in a small city and lightly populated region we are unlikely to participate in part-time and intermittent studies as extensively as universities in more heavily populated areas. Thus, last year in Report #4, the assumption that at Queen's most undergraduate students would proceed directly from high school to completion of a first degree on a full

time basis was reiterated and revised enrolment projections in this report continued to be based on it.

Furthermore, questions about the responsibilities of Queen's and other universities for part-time professional education and upgrading must be considered as well. What continuing responsibility do we have towards our own professional graduates and to others? Should we offer residential courses of varying lengths - in what fields and on what basis? Should we confine ourselves to traditional fields? Might we for example offer short courses in the scientific and social scientific background of particular public issues for the benefit of journalists, trade union leaders, executives, and even politicians? How might the resources available at Queen's best contribute to general post-secondary education in the open sector postulated by the Commission on Post Secondary Education? The answers to these questions are interlocked with overall planning. If we undertake new responsibilities, will they be additional to our existing academic activities or will they to some extent displace these activities either in terms of student enrolment or programs? Because of the complexities of rapidly changing circumstances, the University Council has appointed a Committee on Continuing Education to be chaired by Professor Martyn Estall. This committee will consult

widely within the Queen's community of alumni, faculty, and students and beyond in formulating recommendations on the part Queen's should play in the "learning society" envisaged by the COPSE Report. In particular they are to explore the possible contributions of the new Donald Gordon Centre for Continuing Education which is to open its doors on the Roselawn site in the fall of 1974.

Scholarships and Student Aid

How much does effective demand for full time or continuing education significantly depend on financial aid available to students? At Queen's about 33 per cent of full-time Ontario students draw on the Ontario Student Aid Plan each year. In 1972/73 the average assistance totalled \$1,237. Of this total, \$473. was in outright grant and \$764. in loans. Another seven per cent of Queen's students were assisted through Queen's own scholarship and bursary funds. While the knowledge of the availability of continuing aid throughout a university program is no doubt important to many students in deciding to come to university, it is reasonable to assume that first year admission is the crucial point of accessibility and that once a student has attended university and has found himself successful he will have additional incentive to find the resources to continue.

We have to recognize however that even if the assistance in the form of scholarships and bursaries were not available to first year students at Queen's on the present scale, not all of them would be denied admission to a university on this account. In the case of students who receive less than \$500 under the present student aid scheme, the opportunity remains for them to attend university while living at home depending of course upon whether they live near such a university. In the spring of 1973 two universities instituted massive new scholarship programs for students obtaining more than 80 percent averages in grade XIII in an effort to increase the proportion of such students attending these universities. The success of these initiatives was limited. It would appear that with a generally available provincial scheme which makes it financially possible for any student to attend the university of his choice (i.e., the costs of living away from home and transportation are counted into the calculation of the amount of financial assistance for which the individual is eligible) additional financial assistance is not likely to induce such students to change their minds. Nevertheless the offer of such inducements can be unsettling for students and cannot fail to reduce the credibility of universities as responsible public institutions. Because of the events of last spring the

Council of Ontario Universities has established a committee to recommend guidelines for future scholarship and financial aid policies of individual universities. One possibility which the committee will be exploring is to limit scholarship offers to those students who have been accepted in a particular university and have indicated confirmation of the acceptance. This might be unnecessarily restrictive on the freedom of individual students to change their minds for other reasons particularly if they are sure that they are in the top category of student who will be eligible for a major scholarship award. Since the major object of policy is to allow students to choose universities on academic grounds perhaps it would be permissible for students to receive scholarship offers from any of their first three choices since these are supposedly ranked in order of academic preference. It must be recognized however that the margin of preference among choices will frequently be very slight and subject to change during the six month interval between application and admission. For that reason students should not be denied scholarship offers from universities of second and third choice.

It has been a major objective of admission policy at Queen's over the years to ensure that the student body is representative of all parts of Canada. For a number of years students from Ontario homes have numbered about

80 per cent of the total. About 14 per cent are from other parts of Canada while the remaining six per cent of the students come from abroad. As opportunities for university work have expanded in all parts of Canada fewer students see any obvious advantage in travelling long distances to Kingston for their university education. Therefore, special efforts need to be made to encourage students to come here particularly from more distant areas east, north, and west. Even those growing up within the natural constituency of Queen's Alumni probably need assistance if they are to come to Queen's in sufficient numbers from distant parts of the country. In recent years efforts to attract such students have been strengthened with the help of alumni and a special national bursary program has been instituted. In the current year about one-third of the scholarship and bursary awards from private funds have gone to first year students from parts of Canada outside Ontario.

So far assistance available to part time students under the Ontario Student Aid Program is limited to loans and to those students who are taking such heavy loads of part time work that they are in fact considered to be full time students. However, a student who stays on to do two courses in the spring term does not get any allowance for foregone earnings when his student aid entitlement is

calculated for the following year. Thus provincial student aid policy does not seem entirely consistent with the thrust of the COPSE Report towards greater flexibility in patterns of student attendance at university. Until government policy changes, therefore, there may be considerable gaps in the program which Queen's funds could be used to plug. This matter together with the question of special assistance for students in under-represented groups and in remedial programs is among the matters which will be examined during the coming year in a full fledged review of Queen's scholarship and student assistance policies conducted by the Senate Committee on Scholarships and Student Aid. If our admission policies are to be effective in other respects, we must be sure that our scholarship and bursary policies are based on the correct operational assumptions.

Summary

In this discussion of admissions, continuing education and student aid we have raised a number of questions to be considered by the responsible bodies within the university. How do we find a way to deal with such questions so that the answer to one does not harmfully limit the possible responses to another? We have emphasized in the introduction to this report and in previous reports, the interactive

nature of planning. Nowhere is this principle more evident than in the matters discussed here. What kinds of students, with what preparation do we admit in what numbers to study in what programs by what methods aiming at what outcomes? And the important related question: how far do we wish and are we able to expand the pool of potential students by means of changes in the administration of financial assistance within our control? In the concluding section of this report we shall return to these questions and possible means of approaching them in an integrated way. .

III ACADEMIC DEVELOPMENTS

In Report #4 a year ago we discussed at length a number of matters which are of ongoing importance to the academic work of the university. These included research policy, innovations in curriculum and teaching methods, and the work of the Advisory Council on Statistics. In the following paragraphs we attempt to bring last year's discussion up to date without repeating the content in detail.

Research

Near the end of an extended discussion of research

policy in Report #4 we posed the following questions

"Do we foresee at Queen's the possibility of continuing a pattern of activities in which there are wide differences among individuals in the relative effort given to teaching, research and administration? Is, indeed, such a pattern based primarily on departmental decisions about teaching assignments more likely to match talents and enthusiasms to appropriate tasks than a system in which norms are established and administered centrally?"

We suggested that judgements about the teaching and research activities of individuals "are best arrived at within the departments rather than by the imposition of norms for teaching or external tests for individual research."

In June, 1973, the Advisory Committee on Research of the School of Graduate Studies and Research presented to the Senate its assessment of the recommendations of Quest for the Optimum (the Corry/Bonneau Report on Research) as they might apply to Queen's. In effect the Advisory Committee gave positive answers to the questions quoted above and endorsed the suggested method of arriving at judgements about individuals. For purposes of appointment, evaluation and promotion, the Advisory Committee proposes

further that "comparable consideration" should be given to "frontier or basic research, scholarly publication, recognition in the field of reflective inquiry and quality of teaching."

Thus the Advisory Committee appears to have rejected for Queen's the formalized procedures for comprehensive planning of research effort recommended in Quest for the Optimum, while agreeing that the recommendations may be appropriate elsewhere where the priorities for teaching are not so strongly established.

Statlab

The Advisory Council on Statistics was established in 1971 and a summary of its activities was included in Report #4. In May 1973, it recommended to the Senate the establishment of an ongoing organization designed to provide continuing and broadly accessible statistical consulting services on a university-wide basis. The organization, to be known as Statlab, will be brought into being by reassigning existing staff although its full development depends on its capacity to attract visiting experts from industry and elsewhere for periods of time which might vary from three months to a year. Members of the Queen's faculty will participate in Statlab on a rotating basis contributing to its consulting

services and at the same time developing their own skills.

The Senate Committee on Academic Development based its recommendation of this proposal to the Senate on the belief that it holds great promise for delivering a badly needed service and in the long run, for improving the teaching of statistics at Queen's.

Innovations in curriculum and teaching methods

The discussion of Integrated Studies in Report #4 was continued in SCAD's Report to the Senate in January 1973 on the so-called "Human Problems" resolution of the Senate in March, 1972. The SCAD Report attempted to disentangle the multiple assumptions and objectives of the Senate Resolution and made a number of recommendations addressed to three areas of concern as follows.

- a) Awareness. The Report suggested that faculty might make course content more specifically relevant to human affairs than is sometimes done and that action be taken by the Senate Committee on Fine Arts and Public Lectures jointly with the Education Committee of the Alma Mater Society to ensure that the total program of extra-curricular events is sufficiently varied to offer students wide exposure to the issues of the day. Thirdly the report recommended that such

events be fully publicized at the beginning of each term and regularly through the Gazette.

b) Interdisciplinary options for specialist students.

In the course of its study of the Senate Resolution, SCAD discovered a considerable demand from students in specialist programs for more broadly based options than those now available.

Since the number of options outside their own disciplines is limited such students would welcome courses of a broadly informative kind which would enlarge their understanding of disciplines and professions beyond their own specialization. One such course "Nature, Science and Man" is already well established. Other such interdisciplinary courses could offer senior students in all faculties more than popular insight into practice of science, business and medicine. The recommendation was made therefore that professional faculties consider designing courses for students in other faculties "with the objectives of acquainting such students with the philosophical approach of the profession to the services which it provides, its general methods, and its social aims".

The Faculty of Arts and Science was asked to "consider in the same way the possibility of identifying

professional practice in the humanities, social sciences, physical sciences and the life sciences."

c) The non-specialist student. The Report suggested that interdisciplinary courses such as those suggested in the Senate Resolution would depend on the full commitment of a number of faculty members in several departments and that if initiatives sprang from such individuals they should be welcomed and supported. The Report, pointed out, however, that perhaps the root problem was to achieve coherence in non-specialist programs and outlined a set of possible procedures to achieve this objective without the introduction of new courses or any revision of curriculum. None of the specific suggestions made was recommended, but the Faculty of Arts and Science was asked to consider "the means through which each student who does not choose to pursue specialist programs is assisted to define his program of study in positive terms, with specified objectives, and the means through which his total experience may be evaluated before a degree is granted." The Report suggested, finally that one outcome of the final recommendation might be to permit students to choose as one

objective the thorough understanding of a problem area of particular concern and interest to them and ensure that the courses they select contributed optimally to that purpose. (The Report on the "Human Problems" Resolution appeared in the Gazette, March 28, 1973, Volume V Number 12.)

Program for Instructional Development

This program, established jointly by the Council of Ontario Universities and the Committee on University Affairs, offers considerable encouragement to those interested in using new approaches to instruction or improving established ones. Its purpose is "to assist faculties in Ontario universities in improving the effectiveness of instructional processes by systematic development of objectives, content, methods and evaluation for each course offered, with economy in the application of instructional resources."

The first director of the program is Dr. H. M. Good, Professor of Biology at Queen's. He has established an office at 163 University Avenue and has spent the summer establishing contact with liaison groups nominated by the presidents of each of the universities. Members of the liaison group at Queen's are A. M. Bryans, K. E. Russell, W. J. Barnes, R. D. Norman and A. P. Fell. A workshop is

scheduled for November at which a group drawn from all the Ontario universities will attempt to establish priorities for the future guidance of the program. Guidelines for the awarding of grants for projects will also be developed in the coming months by Dr. Good and the Joint Steering Committee of the CUA and COU. \$150,000 has been allocated for granting purposes for the first year. It is expected that the Ministry of University Affairs will increase this amount substantially depending on the number of projects proposed which meet the criteria. Dr. Good has asked SCAD to draw the attention of the Senate to the establishment of this program and would be pleased to discuss any ideas concerning it with faculty or students.

It is clear that the program has the capacity to assist faculty who wish to develop the flexibility in first year courses which may help to meet some of the problems of admission standards discussed above.

IV ENROLMENT PROJECTIONS

The Senate will be asked to approve at its January meeting a revised set of long term projections adjusted to reflect the estimated effects of enrolment trends apparent in this year's registration.

V CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Perhaps the most important, if not the most obvious conclusion to draw from our discussion of admission policy is that the kind of students admitted has a direct bearing on the allocation of academic resources. In the recent past, a reasonably homogeneous group of first-year students with a common background and tested achievement in grade XIII, required little effort of a so-called "remedial" kind on the part of the university. Resources could be largely concentrated on university courses that began where the high school stopped. Now, with students entering from high school with different backgrounds and levels of preparation in university subjects, with many students having "stopped out" after high school, with increased accessibility for students with incomplete high school training, the university has to face the probable need to put considerable effort and resources into preparatory or "catch up" work. The policy of letting all comers "sink or swim" is not really a possible alternative. This is not the place to examine in detail the ways in which the wide range of possible preparatory needs can be met, although self-paced instruction as pointed out earlier offers obvious possibilities for economy and effectiveness which could leave more resources in place for regular instructional

and research activities.

The question to face here is whether we need to supplement our existing processes in order to consider fully the interacting relationships involved in resolving the complex set of problems we have outlined. It is not sufficient for faculty admissions committees to consider these issues in isolation from each other and from consideration of related curricular and student aid matters. And vice versa. We need, in this case, to ensure that information about the probable consequences of an action in one of the areas discussed is exchanged before tentative policy is formulated rather than after. How can this be ensured?

In our view, the Senate Committee on Academic Development should accept a continuing responsibility to ensure adequate communication between committees within and among the various faculties and take the steps necessary to integrate policy review of admissions and related matters of curriculum, continuing education and student aid. The purpose of such an effort would be to ensure that the Senate does not have to deal with policies developed separately within each faculty and attempt to rationalize these from a university-wide point of view after they have been formally approved by the respective faculties. It would be less consuming of faculty time and would avoid the premature development of fixed positions, if the work of

the various faculty committees could, from the outset interact.

We have not yet considered fully the means by which such coordination of effort might be achieved. One possibility would be to meet at regular intervals with chairmen and members of faculty admissions committees, curriculum committees, with the Senate Committee on Scholarships and Student Aid and with the Council Committee on Continuing Education. In any case, we would hope, that as a result of appropriate initiatives by SCAD, policies on these matters would come forward to the Senate in a form consistent with the objectives of the university as a whole.

It is recommended that the Senate:

- (1) ask faculties to examine criteria and procedures for admission in the light of changes in secondary education and the increasing variety of individual educational experience so that able well-motivated students with a variety of academic backgrounds are considered for admission.

- (2) ask faculties to consider the changes in curriculum and methods of instruction

(particularly in first-level courses) which will meet the needs of a student body with uneven pre-university academic experience.

- (3) ask the Senate Committee on Scholarships and Student Aid to carry out a major review of university policies for the disbursement of non-government university funds and to recommend to the Senate such reallocation of these resources as may be consistent with the goals of admissions policies and with the principle of supplementing, but not overlapping, the provincial student aid program.
- (4) assign to the Senate Committee on Academic Development the continuing responsibility for ensuring close cooperation and continuing exchange of views among faculty and university bodies concerned with the development of admissions policies and related matters of curriculum, continuing education, and student aid, and for ensuring that expert resources within the university are brought to bear in such development.

QUEEN'S GAZETTE

A SUPPLEMENT TO VOLUME IV, NUMBER 33

Senate Statement on Grievance, Discipline and Related Matters

April 27, 1972

RECOMMENDATIONS AS ADOPTED BY THE SENATE

Following each recommendation there is a cross-reference indicating page and column number of the relevant text in the main Report. Example: (2,1) refers to page 2, column 1, i.e. the left hand column.

I. INTRODUCTION

- (1) We urge continued heavy reliance upon the existing informality and multiple channels for handling cases of grievance and discipline: (7,1)
- (2) We recommend that present procedures be augmented by an explicit statement of the rights and responsibilities of the members of the University community and by the addition of more visible formal procedures with clear channels of appeal. (7,1)

II. RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES WITHIN THE UNIVERSITY

- (3) We recommend rejection of the notion that the University administration should act *in loco parentis* that is, in the place of parents, or with parental responsibility for the student before the law. (7,1)
- (4) We recommend that the Principal ensure the preparation of a clear statement of conditions of employment, including appropriate grievance procedures, to cover the supporting staff who are not union members. (8,1)
- (5) We recommend that each body with rule-making authority at Queen's be asked to issue guidelines on the nature and limits of the authority of all decision-makers to whom it has delegated power to act, and that these guidelines be published for the benefit of those subject to the authority. (8,1)
- (6) We recommend that every authorized rule-making body on the campus, the Faculty Boards, Residence Boards, the Inter-Residence Council and the A.M.S., for example, be urged to review and update regularly and publish to those within its jurisdiction any rules, regulations or statements of duties, the breach of which might give rise to discipline or grievances. (8,1)
- (7) We recommend that the following proposed code of conduct should be made the basis for determining what is or is not acceptable conduct at Queen's. In general terms, acceptable conduct does not infringe the rights of other members of the University community and conforms to the regulations of the University and its subordinate jurisdictions and to the law of the land. The following conduct is unacceptable and constitutes an offence within the University community:
 - (a) a violation of published rules and regulations of the University or of any authorized rule-making body within the University;
 - (b) failure to comply with the directions of officials of the University acting within the scope of their authority;
 - (c) a violation of civil law that affects the orderly functioning of the University; these violations

PREFACE

The Senate Committee on Grievance, Discipline and Related Matters was established in January 1970 "to conduct a review of grievance, discipline and related matters within the university community". After receiving briefs and oral representations from a wide range of individuals and groups both within and outside the Queen's University community, and reviewing numerous documents from other universities, the Committee submitted its Interim Report to the Senate in January 1971, and its Final Report in May, 1971.

The adoption in their final form of the fifty-six recommendations which follow was completed at the Senate meeting of April 27, 1972, having been approved by the Board of Trustees on April 14, 1972.

The following statement outlines the specific recommendations as adopted by the Senate. These are followed by the supporting text of the Report of the Senate Committee on Grievance, Discipline and Related Matters, revised to be consistent with the recommendations in their final form.

include assault, libel, slander or other forms of intimidation, vandalism or damage to the property of Queen's or a member of the University community or of the A.M.S. or any other University organization;

(d) a violation of criminal law that affects the orderly functioning of the University;

(e) all forms of academic dishonesty such as plagiarism, cheating, furnishing false information to the University, forgery, misuse of University documents;

(f) a violation of the rights of any member of the University community. (8,1)

(8) We recommend that rules and regulations promulgated by authorized bodies should be consistent with this code, and in situations where no body of promulgated rules and regulations applies, the general provision of the code should govern. (8,1)

(9) We recommend that as far as possible, rule-making bodies that promulgate rules and regulations in accordance with our earlier recommendations should specify the sanctions that apply. (8,2)

III. EXTERNAL RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

(10) There is no privileged status accorded to University members under our public law and none should be accorded in practice. Violations of civil or criminal law should be dealt with principally through the legal system of the country and not through a University system. Our recommendation is that unless University interests are affected, all matters of criminal law are to be left to the police and the proper public authorities. Officials and members of the University must continue to exercise the judgment used by every citizen in deciding whether or not to report any breach of the law to the police. (9,1)

(11) We recommend that: (a) where any member of the University community is not entitled to assistance under the Ontario Legal Aid Plan, and (b) he is subject to a criminal or civil proceeding by reason of any action taken in the performance of his required duties, he should be entitled to hire his own lawyer and to be reimbursed by the University up to the full scale of fees set out in the Ontario Legal Aid Plan. (9,1)

(12) Concerning A.M.S. Constables:

(i) The chief function of the A.M.S. constables should continue to be crowd control at games and social functions. This responsibility should be carried out with firmness and sensitivity. In exercising this responsibility the authority of the A.M.S. constables extends to that of protecting the interests of the University against non-members on University property, and we urge that the A.M.S. establish specific arrangements to cover injuries and liabilities incurred by A.M.S. constables in the carrying out of this responsibility.

(ii) Under no circumstances should the A.M.S. constables be used as detectives or investigators.

(iii) The A.M.S. constables should receive a wage commensurate with the important function they perform.

(iv) In order to ensure the independence of the A.M.S. constables, no University financial subsidization should be permitted. (9,2)

(13) We recommend that in accordance with the recent C.A.U.T. policy the federal government be urged that:

(i) there should be no general continuous, permanently authorized R.C.M.P. surveillance on the campus;

(ii) under no circumstances should the R.C.M.P. be encouraged to place undisclosed agents or informers in University classrooms, societies, offices, or clubs or to recruit such persons;

(iii) no use of electronic or other mechanical listening devices be permitted.

(iv) machinery be set up and publicly announced whereby the University or any member of its staff or student body who finds reason to believe that police surveillance is being performed on the University campus, may appeal to a special government authority named and known as being responsible for dealing with such appeals. (9,2)

(14) We recommend

(i) that the Senate appoint, for a three-year period a Faculty-Student Adviser. The role of the Faculty-Student Adviser will be to assist members of the University community and the police to conduct the legitimate business of the police effectively while protecting the freedom of the University and preventing the misunderstanding that arises from clandestine investigations;

(ii) that members of the University community be advised that any police enquiries should be directed to the Faculty-Student Adviser. Students or staff, such as pathologists, who in their professional capacity have regular contact with the police, should inform the Faculty-Student Adviser of the nature of the relationship and establish the extent to which the services of the Faculty-Student Adviser may be required;

(iii) that all interviews arising out of enquiries initiated by the police be held in the presence of the Faculty-Student Adviser. The Faculty-Student Adviser should ensure that the subject under investigation is the only matter examined by the police;

(iv) that when an individual wishes a formal security clearance in accordance with the normal procedures of the police, he authorize through the Faculty-Student Adviser, in writing, the release of the private information requested by the police. Security enquiries initiated by the individual concerned will be conducted according to the prescribed practice of the police;

(v) that in all police enquiries that are not initiated by the individual concerned, all questions and

answers should be in writing and minutes of the interviews should be kept by the Faculty-Student Adviser. In this type of enquiry, private and confidential information which the University may have on file concerning students and faculty members shall be released only when there has been a warrant issued. And when such a warrant has been issued, the individual being investigated should be permitted to see the file that has been released to the police;

(vi) that the Senate shall receive an annual report from the Faculty-Student Adviser which shall include the number of enquiries received. (10,1)

(15) It is recommended that as discretionary safeguards to protect personal relationships that are formed at the university the following guidelines be recognized :

- All information relating to faculty members, students, or employees of the University and gathered or held by the University, its faculty or other employees, obtained in respect of university affiliation be treated as private except as provided in (ii) and (iii) herein.*
- The following be regarded as public information:
 - Lists of graduates, and scholarships awarded;
 - Local and home address, program in which the student is or was registered, number of years in attendance, degrees obtained and when;
 - Information of the kind now made public by the University in such publications as the Principal's Report, or the Calendars.
- The following private information be excluded from these guidelines recognizing that there are adequate safeguards existing in the standards of professional ethics and the duties required by law:
 - professional communications concerning members of the University (by way of example those commitments among members of the legal or medical professions);
 - necessary communications between faculties and external bodies *having responsibility* for professional qualifications.
- Private information be made available to designated authorized personnel within the University concerned with the purposes for which the information was collected.
- When private information is stored in computer data banks, precautions be taken to ensure that controls are developed to limit access strictly to those individuals prescribed in (iv).
- Except as stated above private factual information be released only with the authorization of the person to whom the information relates. This may be facilitated by a blanket authorization to a department or faculty for a release of information concerning *himself or herself*, as for example by the person seeking employment or entry to other universities. Where information is requested by telephone and when the caller is not personally known, the name and telephone number of the caller should be taken and the call returned.
- A written document may be designated as confidential by the writer. In this case it should be made available only to the addressees named in the document. When a confidential communication is requested, the person asked to *prepare such a communication* should be told to whom or what responsible group or groups the communication will be shown and the purposes for which it will be used.
- When private information, including information designated as confidential, gathered within the University has fulfilled the purpose for which it was collected, it shall be deposited in the Archives of Queen's University and be retained at all times under appropriate security. Any such private information may be consulted by authorized researchers under the supervision of the University Archivist twenty-five years after the subject has left Queen's University with the authorization of the individuals involved or, if deceased, their executors or next of kin, and in any case ten years after the death of the individuals involved. (10,2)
- We recommend that any records which may be necessary for the orderly distribution, location and use of information materials by individuals, which may be maintained by university libraries, are to be used solely for the orderly purposes of library business, and are to be considered private. (11,1)
- We recommend that the Senate maintain the power and responsibility of laying down general rules with regard to student recruitment on campus by off-campus employers and organizations. (11,1)
- We recommend that the Queen's Medical School should continue to assume delegated disciplinary powers from the Ontario College of Physicians and Surgeons. (11,2)

IV. PROPOSED SYSTEM FOR HANDLING GRIEVANCES AND DISCIPLINE WITHIN THE UNIVERSITY

- We recommend retention of the informal methods which currently exist, but we recommend some formalization of the administrative structure for dealing with grievances, and appeals in discipline, to ensure that any grievor can ultimately get a hearing that can be seen to be just. (12,1)
- Discipline is, and should continue to be, meted out by administrative officers of the University, by departmental committees or Faculty Boards, and by the A.M.S. Court. From any of these decisions there should be a right of appeal, and our proposal is simply that such appeals fall into the grievance channel. (12,1)

(21) Wherever possible, students and faculty should be subject to the same procedures, although there will remain structures and procedures peculiar to one group or the other. We do not consider it inappropriate that University members with different responsibilities should be subject to varying sanctions for essentially similar breaches of the Code of Conduct . (12,1)

(22) We propose that there should be a clearly advertised line of appeal in matters of grievance by faculty and students. (13,1)

(23) We recommend the imposition of time limits within which a faculty member or administrator with whom a grievance in writing is lodged must make a decision one way or the other. The faculty member with whom a formal grievance is lodged initially, or a Department Head to whom an appeal is taken, must reply within 2 weeks. A Dean must reply within 3 weeks and the Principal within 2 weeks. Failure to comply with these time limits entitles the grievor to assume that his grievance has been denied.

Also we recommend that unless a formal written grievance is submitted within six weeks of the incident, or last of a series of incidents complained of, the grievor should be precluded from pursuing the matter further. (13,1 & 2)

(24) We propose furthermore that a grievor will lose his right of appeal if he has not served written notice of his intention to appeal further within one week after notification that he has been given an adverse decision. If the administrative decision-maker in question has simply not replied, the grievor must appeal within one month of the elapse of the time set for the administrator's reply. (14,1)

(25) We recommend that any student or faculty member subjected to any decision adverse to his individual interests should have the right to appeal to the next highest decision-maker in the administrative chain, and his appeal should be regarded as a grievance against the decision. (14,2)

(26) Notification of any disciplinary measures should clearly set out both the penalty and the transgression for which it has been imposed, the person to whom the appeal can be made and how, and the limitation period for the appeal. It should also indicate support persons to whom the appellant can turn for assistance. The time for appeal in such cases should be at least one week, which is the time recommended for appeals on grievances, or such longer periods as the decision-making body may allow. Where no such notice has been given, the six-week limitation period applicable to the filing of grievances should apply. (14,2)

(27) We recommend that no penalty other than a reprimand or a warning may be put into effect until the person disciplined has exhausted all channels of appeal, or grievance, as we have previously referred to them, open to him, or until that individual has allowed the time for appeal to lapse. The University administration must, however, retain the power, where necessary, to relieve a staff member of his duties pending the outcome of his appeal, provided that his salary and benefits continue. (14,2)

(28) We recommend that the Dean of Student Affairs not be made part of the formal grievance or disciplinary structure at Queen's. (15,1)

(29) We recommend the continuance of library fines as long as ultimately there is the right of appeal to a "judicial" tribunal. (15,2)

(30) We recommend that the details of the structure and procedures for dealing with discipline in the residences should be left to be worked out by the new Residences Board, for those residences over which it has jurisdiction, and by the governing bodies of each of the other residences. We urge the governing bodies of the various residences to allow an appeal from any residence disciplinary tribunal to the A.M.S. Court on certain specified grounds approved by the governing bodies. (15,2)

(31) We recommend that the A.M.S. Court be retained and given specified new functions. We recommend further that the A.M.S. Court should continue to exercise jurisdiction over students in specified non-academic matters. The A.M.S. Court should have power, as determined by the Code of Conduct, to invoke the full range of sanctions for conduct contrary to the Code, including suspension and expulsion. Any decision requiring a student to withdraw from the University should be appealable directly to the Ultimate Tribunal, by-passing the "Filter". (15,2 & 16,1)

(32) We recommend that there be a "Filter" Tribunal with jurisdiction to determine conclusively whether there is a case to go to the Ultimate Tribunal. Members of the "Filter" will be drawn by lot from a panel of the fourteen student senators, excluding the A.M.S. President or his delegate, and fourteen faculty senators drawn by lot. (16,2)

(33) In addition to secretarial staff, the "Filter" should be assisted by a "Law Clerk", a member of the Law Faculty, who would act as impartial non-voting chairman at all sessions of the "Filter" and advise on matters of law. (16,2)

(34) The "Filter" should be empowered to dismiss appeals as unjustified, to send the appeal to the Ultimate Tribunal, or to order debate in the Senate or in another appropriate deliberative body of the University on short notice, if it determines that questions of principle or policy arise from an issue. (16,2)

(35) We propose that in appeals from the administrative process, the "Filter" should determine whether there is a *prima facie* case; i.e. whether the appellant has been able to show that, based on facts that he purports to be able to prove by plausible evidence, the appellant can make out a case. In the case of appeals from the A.M.S. Court the "Filter" should allow the matter to go to the Ultimate Tribunal except under the provision of Recommendation 31 only if the appellant can make out the *prima facie* case that the A.M.S. Court (i) misinterpreted the Code of Conduct or any promulgated body of rules or regulations in the University; (ii) decided the case in bad faith, in a biased way or otherwise failed to observe the rules of natural justice; (iii) imposed a penalty which is manifestly unequal or otherwise unjust. (17,1 and 2)

(36) There shall be an Ultimate Tribunal with final authority to decide upon the merits of all adjudicative matters of grievance, which include appeals from administrative discipline and appeals from the A.M.S. Court. (17,2)

(37) In the case of appeals from administrative proceedings, we propose that the Ultimate Tribunal should hold a full trial of the matter, requiring the administration to support its action by adducing evidence and by justifying argument. The hearing before the Ultimate Tribunal should normally be open to the public, but the arbitrator should have absolute discretion to close the hearing. (17,2 & 18,2)

(38) Normally, where the Ultimate Tribunal is dealing with appeals from the A.M.S. Court, it will act in a reviewing capacity, rather than hearing new evidence. However, where the Ultimate Tribunal is dealing with a direct appeal from the A.M.S. Court in an expulsion or suspension case, it should hold a full trial of the matter with the onus on the prosecution to establish the disciplinary breach in question. (18,1)

(39) We propose that the Ultimate Tribunal consist of an independent outside arbitrator, assisted in his hearings and deliberations by two nominees who would not, however, join in the making of the actual decision. In appeals from the administrative process, the University administration would name one of the nominees and the grievor would name the other. In appeals from the A.M.S. Court, the A.M.S. would name one nominee, the appellant the other. The nominees would then agree on an arbitrator, the only qualification being that he should be legally trained. In the event that the nominees are unable to agree on an arbitrator within two weeks, we would propose that the Chairman of the Committee of Ontario Law Deans be asked to make the choice from among those legally trained people in the Province who have had experience as Human Rights Inquiry Commissioners or labour arbitrators. The University will be responsible for providing an appropriate place for the hearing of the Ultimate Tribunal after consultation with the outside arbitrator. (18,1)

(40) The Senate could have three functions in the procedures for dealing with matters of grievance and discipline. The "Filter" will be a committee of the Senate, grievances deemed by the "Filter" to be mainly matters of policy would be debated on the floor of the Senate, and the Senate would always have the legislative authority to change any rules relating to grievance and discipline. (18,2)

(41) If any grievor could persuade the Senate to debate his case, the Senate's ruling would obviously overrule that of the Ultimate Tribunal. Our recommendation is that the Senate, as a matter of institutional self-restraint, refuse to perform this function. (18,2)

(42) We recommend that the grievor have the right to be accompanied by the person of his choice at any stage of the grievance procedure and that his adviser be entitled to speak for him if the grievor wishes. (19,1)

(43) We propose that a new post of "Grievance Officer" be created. The Grievance Officer should be the person to whom a student or faculty member could go in cases where, for whatever reason, political, social or psychological, he did not wish to enlist support of other support persons or groups. The Grievance Officer should not formally investigate or otherwise "dispose" of grievances. (19,1)

(44) The Grievance Officer should be a Senate appointment for a three-year renewable term, from the ranks of teaching faculty. The Grievance Officer should have a reduction in other responsibilities if necessary and, if experience proves that he is still overworked, other such officers should be appointed. It is preferable that the Grievance Officer not be absolved completely from teaching duties. (19,1)

(45) We recommend that at any stage prior to the hearing before the Ultimate Tribunal an individual or group be entitled to be represented by counsel of his or their choice, but that they be responsible for their own legal fees. Before the Ultimate Tribunal, any appellant shall have the right to counsel but the University's financial responsibility will be limited to the following:

- (a) the fee of the outside arbitrator on the Ultimate Tribunal;
- (b) the first \$500 of the legal fees incurred by the grievor and related to the appearance before the Ultimate Tribunal;
- (c) above that first \$500 amount, 75% of the grievor's additional legal fee or an additional \$1,000 whichever is the lesser;
- (d) it is understood that the legal fees referred to above are at the scale established under the Ontario Legal Aid Plan for proceedings in County Court. (19,2)

(46) If the University finds itself paying legal fees in more than a total of ten cases or so in the course of the year it would, in our opinion, be quite entitled to call for a reassessment of University policy in this connection. (19,2)

(47) We recommend that the Grievance Procedure in the current Senate Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure be amended to be fully consistent in all respects with our recommendations outlined in Part IV of this Report. (20,2)

(48) We recommend that it be made very clear that the decision to grant or deny tenure is to be based on an overall assessment of a probationary faculty member's performance. Thus, in no case should the tenure determination be initiated, continued or completed while a grievance or an appeal from discipline affecting a faculty member is in process. Once the appeal procedure has been exhausted, the decision to grant or deny tenure may be made. (20,2)

(49) Appeals against decisions relating to salary and promotion which do not involve matters of tenure, should fall into the normal grievance channels, except that they should not proceed by way of the 'Filter' and Ultimate Tribunal. (20,2)

(50) We recommend that on any appeal to the Tenure Appeal Committee the applicant be advised by the Committee of the grounds upon which tenure has been denied, that he be given copies of all documents, other than confidential documents put before the

Committee and that he be told if confidential documents are relied upon and informed of their contents to the extent permitted by confidentiality. (20,2)

- (51) We recommend that on matters of procedure the Tenure Appeal Committee should consult and weigh carefully the advice of the University solicitor, or other lawyer appointed for the purpose. (20,2)
- (52) We recommend that every probationary appointee be given a clear and unambiguous statement of the rules about probationary appointments generally applicable in his Faculty and Department or School, and of the particular conditions attaching to his case. (20,2)
- (53) We recommend that the A.M.S. constables be given responsibility and authority to control crowds at formal university functions, including athletic and social events, and to deal with disorder and disruption on the campus. (20,2)
- (54) Students apprehended by A.M.S. constables in the course of such activities should be charged before the A.M.S. Court or reported to the responsible administrative officer for disciplinary consideration as appropriate. Faculty and non-academic staff involved in such activities would, in the same way, be reported to the responsible officer of the University. Non-members of the University would be reported to the police, as would students and staff where appropriate, within the terms of our Recommendation (10). (21,1)
- (55) In the event of violence or destruction on campus beyond the control of the A.M.S. constables, we recommend that the Principal be empowered to declare, after as wide consultation as is feasible in the circumstances, with A.M.S. officers among others, that for up to 48 hours a state of emergency prevails. A state of emergency for more than 48 hours should have to be declared by the Senate and could be rescinded only by the Senate. When a state of emergency has been declared, the Principal should have the power to call for the help of the police or other public authorities. Their activities will, of course, be governed by the law of the land. We recommend that as soon as possible after the summoning of the police the state of emergency be declared at an end and the normal system of grievance and discipline be restored. Members of the University apprehended during the state of emergency should be disciplined by the University in accordance with the restored system of discipline and appeals. (21,1)
- (56) We would recommend, following its approval by Senate, that this report be referred to the appropriate bodies within the University with instructions that action be taken where applicable. (21,1)

Text of the Report of the Senate Committee on Grievance, Discipline, and Related Matters

INTRODUCTION

Where large numbers of human beings, even those with ostensibly common interests, are gathered together, especially in the context of the 1970s, there will inevitably arise tensions, conflicts of purpose and opinion and impressions of injustice and unfair treatment. The Queen's University community has grown rapidly and the communications revolution has thrust us into the midst of academic change taking place in all corners of the world. Appropriate and effective machinery must be available to protect the rights of members of this University and to resolve real or imagined grievances. Otherwise an acute sense of frustration may promote apathy or precipitate serious disruption.

We stress at the outset that the University must not attempt to stifle dissent or disagreement on the campus. Dissent, ideally, is vigorous, stimulating, the catalyst of change, and should be encouraged as a natural and beneficial aspect of normal university activity. At the same time, there is no acceptable justification for instigating or participating in conduct or actions that would through violence, intimidation, obstruction, disruption or wilful destruction interfere with the rights of other members of the Queen's community. Thus, in our approach to the question of grievances and discipline, we have stressed two interrelated aspects: first, we have attempted to set forth in Chapters 2 and 3 the rights and responsibilities appropriate to membership in an academic community; second, we have suggested in Chapter 4 appropriate structures and procedures which will enable cases of grievance and discipline to be dealt with effectively and fairly in an orderly way.

This Committee is convinced that the rights and responsibilities which apply to faculty, students and supporting staff by virtue of their membership in an academic community should be made clear and explicit. The central functions of the university community are learning, teaching, research and scholarship. Therefore, the relations among its members must be characterized by free expression, freedom from political interference, intellectual honesty and respect for the opinions and dignity of others. The rights and responsibilities of the members of the University derive from these requirements. When individuals within the Queen's community violate the essential rights of other members or abrogate their own responsibilities, discipline must be readily available to those in authority, but the application of discipline must be not only fair, it must be seen to be fair, and therefore, subject to appeal and review. The same applies to grievances which arise when there is an apparent breach of right, a neglect of responsibility, or an inappropriate application of discipline. There must be effective informal and formal procedures for seeking redress of grievances and appealing against discipline if embittered relations among members of the University community are to be avoided.

With these considerations in mind we have attempted to evaluate the current procedures at Queen's University for dealing with cases of grievance and discipline. The present arrangements

appear to us to be characterized by three features: multiple channels for resolution, informality, and low visibility. The advantages of these characteristics have been stressed to us repeatedly in briefs and representations made to us. Our Committee is firmly convinced that there are positive values inherent in the availability of multiple channels, particularly the many informal channels which encourage the resolution of most difficulties at an early stage and without the glare of publicity. At the same time, it has become clear to us that there are also some serious deficiencies in the present procedures. The very characteristics which have proved so effective in some ways have tended, as the University has grown and become more complex, to create confusion and insecurity because many members of the University community are unsure of the appropriate channels to use. A very personal, informal and low-key approach to grievances has often added to frustration by creating a real or imagined brick-wall blocking further appeals against an unfavourable decision or failure to resolve difficulties.

The main thrust of our recommendations is two-fold. First, we urge continued heavy reliance upon the existing informality and multiple channels for handling cases of grievance and discipline. But second, in order to overcome some of the present deficiencies, we recommend that the present procedures be augmented by an explicit statement of the rights and responsibilities of the members of the University community and by the addition of more visible formal procedures with clear channels of appeal.

II RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES WITHIN THE UNIVERSITY

The Nature of the University Community

The University, composed of students, faculty and supporting staff, is a community engaged in teaching, learning, research and scholarship. There must be a commitment on the part of all members of the Queen's community to maintain an atmosphere conducive and appropriate to these activities. From this purpose and commitment the essential rights and responsibilities of members of the University community are derived. Rights imply responsibilities which are the cost of the enjoyment of rights. The very act of coming to Queen's to teach or learn or work, and thereby joining the University community, involves a tacit agreement to respect its fundamental purposes.

All members of the university community, students, faculty and supporting staff, enjoy the same basic rights in relation to each other and are bound by the same responsibilities to respect the rights of others, as are all citizens. Among these basic rights are freedom of expression, freedom of peaceful assembly and association, freedom of political belief, and freedom from personal force and violence, threats of violence, and personal abuse. In addition, specific rights and responsibilities apply to each of these groups in relation to the particular role they occupy within the university.

Rights and Responsibilities

Students: Students are fully accountable and wholly responsible individuals. We therefore reject the concept of the University *acting in loco parentis*, that is, in the place of parents, or with parental responsibility for the student before the law. Each student has a personal responsibility to fulfil the purpose of the University by pursuing to good advantage a program of study to which he has been admitted by the University and by not interfering with the free pursuit of knowledge by his fellow students and teachers. As well as responsibilities the student has associated rights:

- (1) the right of admission to any course within the University for which he is qualified, in accordance with established priorities where facilities or services are limited;
- (2) the right to consult with his instructors during normal working hours, having due regard to the rights of other students and to the time that an instructor may reasonably devote to a particular subject;
- (3) the right to fair examination under the practice of the Faculty or School in which the student is registered;
- (4) the right of access to classrooms, laboratories, libraries and other necessary facilities and services in accordance with the requirements of the program of study and the regulations of the University;
- (5) the right to work and study free from undue disturbance;
- (6) the right to ask that a University regulation or policy be reviewed, in the expectation that the request will be brought before the appropriate body;
- (7) the right to express opinions, criticisms and dissent freely.

Faculty: The Faculty members are appointed to prepare and present courses, teach and examine, to supervise graduate research, to pursue research and scholarship and to assist in policy-making and administration in the University. They have a responsibility to carry out their various functions to the best of their abilities. The rights of academic staff are determined by their terms of employment, which incorporate a very important body of custom, peculiar to the role of the academics in society and designed to preserve academic freedom. Some of the most important of these rights are codified in the Senate Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure. There are other rights which derive from the purposes of the University:

- (1) the right to teach, to supervise, to pursue research and contribute to the administration of the University in any capacity to which they are appointed, and to do any other work sanctioned by the University free from undue disturbance;
- (2) the right of access to classrooms, laboratories, libraries and other necessary facilities and services;
- (3) the right to express opinions, criticism and dissent within the traditional context of academic freedom.

Supporting Staff: The supporting staff are employed by the University to fulfil various functions. The rights and responsibilities of supporting staff are governed by their employment relationship with the University. Their general responsibility is to perform the services for which they are employed by the University. In meeting these responsibilities, staff members have concomitant rights consistent with their positions and professional responsibilities within the University, and have:

- (1) the right of access to work;
- (2) the right to work free from undue disturbance, and
- (3) the right to fair and equitable procedures which govern the application of discipline and the hearing of grievances.

The supporting staff who are members of a union have collective agreements with the University which set out employ-

ment conditions and include grievance procedures. This report does not make any proposals with regard to rights and responsibilities under those agreements.

The supporting staff who are not members of a union, including the professional administrative staff, the staff of the computing centre, the professional librarians, and the clerical and other non-professional staff, do not at present have a clear statement of their conditions of employment. Because of the diverse roles and conditions of employment within this group, the Committee does not feel competent to make recommendations for detailed procedures. We recommend that the Principal ensure the preparation of a clear statement of conditions of employment, including appropriate grievance procedures, to cover the supporting staff who are not union members. We recommend that these procedures embody the general principles emphasized in our report; a maximum use of informal channels and free access to formal channels. Furthermore, we would urge that before establishing these procedures, the officers of the University consult widely with representatives of the various groups of supporting staff.

Authority in the University

The authority of the Board of Trustees, the Senate and the Faculty Boards is set out in the University Charter and in the constitutions of the Senate and the Faculty Boards. Authority is delegated by them to other bodies and individuals. In many cases the authority assigned to individuals has not been clearly defined. While this has encouraged the exercise of considerable initiative by some individuals with good results for the community, it has potentially serious disadvantages. Where the extent of authority is unclear, it is all too easy to act beyond its limits and thus improperly, or to fail to act up to the limits of authority and leave responsibilities unfulfilled.

Faculty members tend to learn the limits of their authority by a process of informal discussion and by observation. Even those acting in administrative capacities often have no guidelines other than perceived past practice. Students usually have less experience than faculty in the University community and are even more at the mercy of conventional wisdom. We recommend, therefore, that each body with rule-making authority at Queen's be asked to issue guidelines on the nature and limits of the authority of all decision-makers to whom it has delegated power to act, and that these guidelines be published for the benefit of those subject to the authority.

A Code of Conduct

Notions of the legitimate purposes of the University differ and where interests clash, broad generalities do not produce solutions. Without ascertainable rules of conduct, discipline appears arbitrary and grievances sink unresolved. On the other hand, a highly specific code would give rise to a whole range of legalistic problems and, as well, would probably not be widely read or generally understood.

Careful consideration of this question of "code or no code" has led us to make the following recommendations: first, that every authorized rule-making body on the campus, the Faculty Boards, Residence Boards, the Inter-Residence Council and the A.M.S., for example, be urged to review and update regularly and publish to those within its jurisdiction any rules, regulations or statements of duties, the breach of which might give rise to discipline or grievances; second, that the following proposed code of conduct be made the basis for determining what is or is not acceptable conduct at Queen's. Rules and regulations promulgated by authorized bodies should be consistent with this code, and in situations where no body of promulgated rules and regulations applies, the general provision of the code should govern.

In general terms, acceptable conduct does not infringe the rights of other members of the University community and conforms to the regulations of the University and its subordinate jurisdictions and to the law of the land. The following conduct is unacceptable and constitutes an offence within the University community:

- (a) a violation of published rules and regulations of the University or of any authorized rule-making body within the University;
- (b) failure to comply with the directions of officials of the University acting within the scope of their authority;
- (c) a violation of civil law that affects the orderly functioning of the University; these violations include assault, libel, slander or other forms of intimidation, vandalism or damage to the property of Queen's or a member of the University community or of the A.M.S. or any other University organization.
- (d) a violation of criminal law that affects the orderly functioning of the University;
- (e) all forms of academic dishonesty such as plagiarism, cheating, furnishing false information to the University, forgery, misuse of University documents;
- (f) a violation of the rights of any member of the University community.

Sanctions

A code of conduct must include some indication of sanctions. The penalties available and appropriate to Universities are few. Within the University the mildest form of sanction is the informal reprimand or rebuke. Somewhat more serious is the written warning, which usually puts the recipient on notice that more stringent disciplinary measures will result if there is a further breach. Probation is the next step, involving an order of suspension or expulsion to take effect upon the specified further transgressions, which may be quite minor in themselves. A suspension of privileges to recreational non-academic facilities is particularly appropriate where there has been some abuse of the facility in question. Suspension of the right to attend classes or to use particular academic facilities may be serious if the period is prolonged. Suspension of full University privileges is even more serious. Expulsion from the University or termination of appointment is the most serious sanction available to the University.

In general we do not favour the use of fines as a University sanction because their effect varies so widely depending on the resources of the person fined. On the other hand, an order of restitution may be particularly appropriate where there has been damage to University property.

With respect to academic and non-academic staff members, an adverse effect on salary and promotion will obviously be a major sanction.

We recommend that, as far as possible, rule-making bodies that promulgate rules and regulations in accordance with our earlier recommendations should specify the sanctions that apply.

III. EXTERNAL RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Public Law and the Civil Authorities

The human rights protected by our laws and inherent in our political system are held in common by those within the University community and those outside it, as is the responsibility

to obey the laws of the land. A member of the University community is liable to legal action on two fronts. He is simultaneously a member of two societies: his university community and Canadian society at large. Membership in a university society has no effect on the rules governing conduct in Canadian society. A university is not a sanctuary, and there is no privileged status accorded to University members under our public law and none should be accorded in practice.

A person should not be subject to double jeopardy, that is, he should not be subjected to two similar prosecutions or court actions for the same act. He may, however, be subject to two codes of behaviour at the same time, and such double jurisdiction does not necessarily constitute double jeopardy. Different interests may be protected and different issues may be raised. For example, if a student destroyed or damaged University property, he could be prosecuted in the ordinary courts of the land or in the A.M.S. Court, or in both. In the criminal courts the public interest is protected. In the A.M.S. Court the University's private interest is protected, by a restitution order for example. In most cases, however, two prosecutions or legal actions should not occur because there is an element of double jeopardy in many cases of double jurisdiction. Violations of civil or criminal law should be dealt with principally through the legal system of the country and not through a University system. Many offences, however, that could theoretically be taken to civil court may not warrant the time and expense of court proceedings and may, therefore, be dealt with only within the University jurisdiction. This is so in many groups within society and is not unique to universities. Certain minor offences may thus be dealt with, for example, solely by officers of the University administration or by the A.M.S. judicial system in the case of students.

Problems will arise in determining the limits of the jurisdiction of the disciplinary system of the University where the law of the land is broken. The guiding principle that must be emphasized constantly is that the University will only act when it feels that its own vital interests, as defined in its Code, are affected. Our recommendation is that unless University interests are affected, all matters of criminal law are to be left to the police and the proper public authorities.

Much concern has been expressed to the Committee on what duty members of the University have to report criminal offences. We are advised that under the law in Canada today no person, including the officers of the University, would be obliged to report a criminal offence to the police as long as the failure to report did not constitute what may be considered to be an act of encouragement. Officials and members of the University must continue to exercise the judgment used by every citizen in deciding whether or not to report any breach of the law to the police. We recognize, of course, that the police may carry out investigations and make arrests on campus where these relate to breaches of the criminal law.

The officers of the University do not, in every case, have the choice of whether a matter of dispute is to be resolved in University forums rather than the courts. Proceedings in the courts against the University itself or students or members of the faculty, although still rare, are becoming less rare. We are concerned about the position of the individual member of the Queen's community who gets embroiled in such a law suit, usually through no fault of his own. An A.M.S. constable, for example, might be sued by another student or a faculty member for alleged use of undue force. Whether or not the action was well-founded, legal expenses would be involved in defending the action.

Another example is afforded by a student who seeks to redeem a failing grade by a case in the courts. The student will almost certainly lose the case, but the faculty member involved will lose financially too if he has to take the precaution of hiring a competent lawyer. Often it will be prudent for him to hire his

own lawyer, as he may have different interests from the University itself. For instance the University might be prepared to accept a settlement that a faculty member would regard as damaging to his academic reputation.

We recommend that (a) where any member of the University community is not entitled to assistance under the Ontario Legal Aid Plan, and (b) he is subject to a criminal or civil proceeding by reason of any action taken in the performance of his required duties, he should be entitled to hire his own lawyer and to be reimbursed by the University up to the full scale of fees set out in the Ontario Legal Aid Plan.

A.M.S. Constables

A.M.S. constables play an extremely important role in maintaining good order among Queen's students as well as in preventing damage to University property. The excellent relations existing between the A.M.S. constables and Queen's students, and between the A.M.S. constables and the Kingston police must continue to exist. It is therefore recommended that:

- (i) the chief function of the A.M.S. constables should continue to be crowd control at games and social functions. This responsibility should be carried out with firmness and sensitivity. In exercising this responsibility, the authority of the A.M.S. constables extends to that of protecting the interests of the University against non-members on University property, and we urge that the A.M.S. establish specific arrangements to cover injuries and liabilities incurred by A.M.S. constables in the carrying out of this responsibility.
- (ii) Under no circumstances should the A.M.S. constables be used as detectives or investigators.
- (iii) The A.M.S. constables should receive a wage commensurate with the important function they perform.
- (iv) In order to ensure the independence of the A.M.S. constables, no University financial subsidization should be permitted.

The R.C.M.P. and Police on Campus

The presence, real and imagined, of police, especially of R.C.M.P. officers engaged in surveillance of thought, at Canadian universities has introduced an explosive element into the delicately balanced sphere of student and faculty discipline. Existing tensions have been further exacerbated by wide circulation of actual or rumoured R.C.M.P. activities on campus. This heightening of tension mirrors the already deep-rooted anxieties about police surveillance in an academic world where free enquiry and freedom of expression are at the heart of the learning process. This Committee categorically rejects the notion that the R.C.M.P. or any other police force should clandestinely carry out investigations into the "political" beliefs of any member of the University. The police should be concerned with the activities of criminals, not with the ideas, however disconcerting, generated at the University. It is therefore recommended:

- (1) that in accordance with the recent C.A.U.T. policy the federal government be urged that:
 - (i) there should be no general continuous permanent-authorized R.C.M.P. surveillance on the campus;
 - (ii) under no circumstances should the R.C.M.P. be encouraged to place undisclosed agents or informers in University classrooms, societies, offices, or

clubs or to recruit such persons;

- (iii) no use of electronic or other mechanical listening devices be permitted;
- (iv) machinery be set up and publicly announced whereby the University or any member of its staff or student body who finds reason to believe that police surveillance is being performed on the University campus may appeal to a special government authority named and known as being responsible for dealing with such appeals;
- (2) that the Senate appoint, for a three-year period, a Faculty-Student Adviser. The role of the Faculty-Student Adviser will be to assist members of the University community and the police to conduct the legitimate business of the police effectively, while protecting the freedom of the University and preventing the misunderstanding that arises from clandestine investigations;
- (3) that members of the University community be advised that any police enquiries should be directed to the Faculty-Student Adviser. Students or staff, such as pathologists, who in their professional capacity have regular contact with the police, should inform the Faculty-Student Adviser of the nature of the relationship and establish the extent to which the services of the Faculty-Student Adviser may be required;
- (4) that all interviews arising out of enquiries initiated by the police be held in the presence of the Faculty-Student Adviser. The Faculty-Student Adviser should ensure that the subject under investigation is the only matter examined by the police;
- (5) that when an individual wishes a formal security clearance in accordance with the normal procedures of the police, he authorize through the Faculty-Student Adviser, in writing, the release of the private information (as defined later in this chapter) requested by the police. Security enquiries initiated by the individual concerned will be conducted according to the prescribed practice of the police;
- (6) that in all police enquiries that are not initiated by the individual concerned, all questions and answers should be in writing and minutes of the interviews should be kept by the Faculty-Student Adviser. In this type of enquiry, private and confidential information (as defined later in this chapter) which the University may have on file concerning students and faculty members shall be released only when there has been a warrant issued. And when such a warrant has been issued, the individual being investigated should be permitted to see the file that has been released to the police;
- (7) that the Senate shall receive an annual report from the Faculty-Student Adviser which shall include the number of enquiries received.

It is obvious that the University cannot force the R.C.M.P. or other police and security agencies to act according to our directions. It is appropriate, however, that the University, delineate procedures for its members which will facilitate legitimate police enquiries while at the same time preserving essential rights and protections for members of the University community, especially the rights and freedoms associated with ideological views or opinions. This Committee believes that police have legi-

timate functions to fulfil on campus when pursuing an investigation arising from a breach of criminal law, or in the instance of an emergency situation in which potentially criminal or riotous behaviour appears imminent, or non-members of the University are unwilling to comply with the directions of the A.M.S. constables. In the latter case, the A.M.S. constables should have the right to request the presence of one or two city policemen (or in the case of large gatherings such as those in the football stadium about half a dozen), but the request for a larger number of police should require the procedure for emergencies set forth at the end of Part IV of our report. While recognizing that the police do have some legitimate functions to fulfil on campus, we categorically reject the notion that it is the business of the police to touch on any area related to "thought control", or the ideological views or opinions of any member of the University community. To this purpose, the Faculty-Student Adviser will represent a University resource providing advice, experience and protection to benefit all members of the University community in their relationships with the police, particularly in those cases relating to a security enquiry.

Confidentiality and Release of Information about Members of the Academic Community

In the same way as other citizens, members of the University community have the right to enjoy confidentiality concerning their personal and private lives. It is, however, necessary for the University, for its normal operation, to possess some personal information about faculty and students.

It is recommended that as discretionary safeguards to protect personal relationships that are formed at the university the following guidelines be recognized:

- (i) *All information relating to faculty members, students, or employees of the University and gathered or held by the University, its faculty or other employees, obtained in respect of university affiliation be treated as private except as provided in (ii) and (iii) herein.*
- (ii) The following be regarded as public information:
 - (a) Lists of graduates, and scholarships awarded;
 - (b) Local and home address, program in which the student is or was registered, number of years in attendance, degrees obtained and when;
 - (c) Information of the kind now made public by the University in such publications as the Principal's Report, or the Calendars.
- (iii) The following private information be excluded from these guidelines, recognizing that there are adequate safeguards existing in the standards of professional ethics and the duties required by law:
 - (a) professional communications concerning members of the University (by way of example those commitments among members of the legal or medical professions);
 - (b) necessary communications between faculties and external bodies having responsibility for professional qualifications.
- (iv) Private information be made available to designated authorized personnel within the University concerned with the purposes for which the information was collected.
- (v) When private information is stored in computer data banks, precautions be taken to ensure that

controls are developed to limit access strictly to those individuals prescribed in (iv).

(vi) Except as stated above, private factual information be released only with the authorization of the person to whom the information relates. This may be facilitated by a blanket authorization to a department or faculty for a release of information concerning *himself or herself*, as for example by the person seeking employment or entry to other universities. Where information is requested by telephone and when the caller is not personally known, the name and telephone number of the caller should be taken and the call returned.

(vii) A written document may be designated as confidential by the writer. In this case it should be made available only to the addressees named in the *document*. When a confidential communication is requested, the person asked to *prepare such a communication* should be told to whom or what responsible group or groups the *communication* will be shown and the purposes for which it will be used.

(viii) When private information, including information designated as confidential, gathered within the University has fulfilled the purpose for which it was collected, it shall be deposited in the Archives of Queen's University and be retained at all times under appropriate security. Any such private information may be consulted by authorized researchers under the supervision of the University Archivist twenty-five years after the subject has left Queen's University with the authorization of the individuals involved or, if deceased, their executors or next of kin, and in any case ten years after the death of the individuals involved.

Privacy of Library Records

It is clear that informational materials are a significant part of the resources of knowledge available to all members of the University community. In this community, University libraries have the responsibility of collecting, arranging, preserving and making available and assisting in the use of information materials. However, the freedom of intellectual enquiry, study, discussion and the freedom to read materials representing many points of view on any subject are basic to the purposes of the University. Therefore, no member of the University should be subject to any pressure resulting from a record of what he has read.

We recommend that any records which may be necessary for the orderly distribution, location and use of information materials by individuals, which may be maintained by University libraries, are to be used solely for the orderly purposes of library business, and are to be considered *private*.

Recruitment on the Campus

In recent years students at Queen's and elsewhere have objected to the presence on the campus of recruiters for industries regarded by the objectors as being immoral. The argument is that to make its facilities thus available amounts to complicity by the University. The response is made that to deny access to the campus for some recruiters is to deny potentially interested students full freedom in their choice of jobs.

We recommend that the Senate maintain the power and responsibility of laying down general rules in regard to student recruitment on campus by off campus employers and organizations.

Special Status of Medical Students

As an important part of their training, Medical students must assume clinical responsibilities. Because of the special nature of this clinical experience, the student is subject to the disciplinary code laid down by the Ontario College of Physicians and Surgeons. It is therefore felt by the Committee that the Queen's Medical School should continue to assume delegated disciplinary powers from the Ontario College of Physicians and Surgeons.

IV. PROPOSED SYSTEM FOR HANDLING GRIEVANCES AND DISCIPLINE WITHIN THE UNIVERSITY

Overview of the Proposed System: Informality and Formality Combined

We assume that students, faculty, and non-academic staff are to be recognized as rights-bearing members of the Queen's University community. All three groups must be able individually and collectively to resist pressures and to dispute penalties which are inconsistent with their rights or the rules by which the University is governed.

Informality

As far as is consistent with ensuring protection for the rights of those who make up the University community, we propose that existing structures for dealing with grievances and discipline be retained. Most clashes between members of the University community are best resolved informally by discussion. Even where discussion aided by conciliation is not successful, there are many disagreements which should continue to be settled, as they are now, simply by the decision of a person in authority. Administrators in the University, as part of their duties, can be expected to make responsible decisions. If too many of these decision-making functions are transferred to committees or tribunals of students and faculty, an unwieldy structure will be built. We must avoid the creation of a decision-making process that is unduly demanding on the time and energy of people who wish to devote themselves to teaching and learning. Present structures for dealing with grievance and discipline should, in general, therefore, be retained, but not without some changes.

At present the faculty member or administrator to whom a grievance comes will try first to settle the matter, perhaps by granting some concession or by bringing together those involved to seek a reasonable solution. Grievances initiated with a faculty member may be taken up with the Department Head or Dean involved. It appears that most grievances are settled in this way. Only occasionally is a grievance referred to a higher level of administration or to a Departmental Council or Faculty Board.

Particularly where a student complaint is involved, it is dangerous to assume that all is well because a "settlement" is achieved in the sense that a grievance is "dropped". A student may not wish to give offence by proceeding to a higher level, or he or she may not know where to go. A series of references back and forth to this or that administrator, or even a series of meetings at various times when the faculty member involved is available may lead to a grievance being "dropped" because the grievor "isn't getting anywhere" or "is being given the run around". Such "settlements" can only contribute to general dissatisfaction. Unfortunately, in the University, as in every large organization, there are those who, perhaps unconsciously, come to rely on these means of disposing of problems.

We are satisfied that in most cases grievances or complaints are given real consideration by Department Heads, Deans and other Officers of the University, provided the grievance is well articulated, and presented to the appropriate officer of the University. That is not to say that students or faculty who are

inarticulate, or who do not know whom to approach, or who are making basic challenges, are never given an adequate hearing at Queen's. They are, and on the whole we are convinced of the good faith of those charged with dealing with such matters. But the fact remains that many members of the University community do not know what their rights are, who to approach with a complaint, how to demonstrate the validity of their grievances, and where to go next if the matter is not settled to their satisfaction.

We wish to make it unmistakably clear that we are in favour of retaining an informal method of settling grievances which, we feel certain, will continue to be the best means of achieving solutions satisfactory to both the University and persons with grievances. We will, nevertheless, propose some formalizations of the administrative structure for dealing with grievances, and appeals in discipline, to ensure that any grievor can ultimately get a hearing that can be seen to be just. For example, under our proposal, a grievance must be in writing if a Dean or higher administrative officer is to be obliged to deal with it within a limited time. However, it must not be inferred that the obligation of a Dean or anyone else to give serious consideration to an oral grievance should be in any degree lessened. Similarly, we will propose a hierarchy through which the grievor must proceed if he is to be entitled to force a decision one way or another at any level, but that is not to say that the student or faculty member is precluded from making a complaint initially to whomever he wishes.

Formality

The University Senate is the legislative body which determines how the University community is to function. As such, the Senate is the appropriate forum for the debate of policy matters, but is inappropriate for the adjudication of questions relating to the individual discipline or grievance, although, theoretically, it would always have the power to take upon itself the jurisdiction to decide any individual cases. We recommend, therefore, that there be superimposed upon existing grievance and discipline processes an ultimate appeal to an impartial decision-making body. This Ultimate Tribunal would in practice make the final decision in all cases of individual grievance and discipline. We assume that the Senate would not enter into consideration of any individual case once this new tribunal has been established.

Two other matters of general policy inherent in our proposals warrant particular attention. First, we do not propose to draw any clear line between "grievances" and "discipline". Generally, discipline is, and should continue to be, meted out by administrative officers of the University, by departmental committees or Faculty Boards, and by the A.M.S. Court. From any of these decisions there should be a right of appeal, and our proposal is simply that such appeals fall into the grievance channel. In the case of expulsion or suspension from the University, however, the appeal procedure should be expedited, as explained below. Second, wherever possible, students and faculty should be subject to the same procedures, although there will remain, of course, structures and procedures peculiar to one group or the other, like the tenure appeal system and the A.M.S. Court.

We do not consider it inappropriate that where students and staff are together involved in breaches of the Code of Conduct, the A.M.S. Court have jurisdiction over students, whereas members of faculty or supporting staff would be subject to administrative sanctions. A different range of sanctions or penalties are available for different members of the University community and, quite properly, the appropriate sanctions may vary with the nature of the responsibility which the member

involved bears to the University. Moreover, true equality of punishment demands consideration of the different impact that the same sanction might have on the various individuals involved.

Grievance channels and disciplinary procedures must be much better advertised, with some emphasis placed upon our suggested time limits. Individuals must not see their concerns swallowed up and lost in the depths of the administration. Bottlenecks in the decision-making process must be removed, and individuals must be granted means of ensuring that decisions are made, one way or another, within reasonable time on grievances raised within the time limits.

Proposed Structure in Outline: In broadest outline, the five principal components of our proposed structure for dealing with grievance and discipline are:

(i) **The present structures.** These include, for example, administrative procedures, Faculty Boards and their committees, the A.M.S. Court and Residence Tribunals. These structures must be better advertised and modified to ensure that the grievor can move to the next decision-making level within reasonable time and ultimately to an impartial Ultimate Tribunal.

(ii) **A filtering tribunal.** Appeals from all administrative decisions and the decisions of lesser judicial tribunals in the University must be taken to the "Filter" before proceeding to the Ultimate Tribunal. The "Filter's" function will not be to decide on the substance of any particular case appealed to it but rather to determine whether a further hearing is required. The "Filter" will be empowered to dispose of any appeal in one of three ways. It may dismiss an appeal where no *prima facie* case has been made, it may permit an appeal to proceed to the Ultimate Tribunal, or it may characterize the issue as a political or policy grievance rather than an adjudicative matter, and move it onto the floor of the Senate. An "adjudicative" matter is one that takes the form of a dispute between two parties which can be settled by finding the facts and applying to them a predetermined standard or rule.

(iii) **The Ultimate Tribunal.** This tribunal must be, and must be seen to be, impartial as between individuals and representatives of the interests in conflict. Its function will be essentially adjudicative, that is, it will not be a policy-making body, and it will have final authority to dispose of matters properly appealed to it. The function of the Ultimate Tribunal will be to determine the facts in any grievance brought before it, and to judge those facts against the applicable rules made by duly authorized bodies in the University, or the general terms of the proposed Code of Conduct.

(iv) **The Senate.** Where the "Filter" has characterized the grievance as a political or policy grievance, it will have power, on short notice, to order debate on the matter in the Senate, with the right to speak guaranteed to the proponents of the grievance.

(v) **Support Groups.** We recognize that many of the individuals governed by our proposed system of dealing with grievances and discipline, will lack the skills, self-confidence or knowledge of the system needed to ensure full protection of their rights as members of the University community. We therefore propose means of ensuring that any grievor has available to him the support of peer groups, or a special officer to advise and guide his appeal.

We will now deal with each of the components in greater detail and then consider briefly the problem of legal costs and the role of counsel before University tribunals, the role of a possible ombudsman, University tenure arrangements in relation

to our proposals, and the problem of violence and massive disruption on the campus.

A Structure for Grievances and Discipline:

Some Detailed Considerations

1 Present Structures. Each department and Faculty, and the Principal's Office, should be directed to amend its present procedures in accordance with our recommendations, and where our recommendations are not directly applicable, the general principles inherent in them should be observed. For present purposes we will examine and make proposals with regard to the following channels through which administrative discipline proceedings flow:

- (a) Administrative and Faculty Board Grievance Channels
- (b) Administrative Disciplinary Channels
- (c) The Dean of Student Affairs
- (d) Disciplinary Decisions in the Library System
- (e) Residence Disciplinary Tribunals
- (f) A.M.S. Court

(A) Administrative and Faculty Board Grievance Channels. We recommend the imposition of time limits within which a faculty member or administrator with whom a grievance is lodged must make a decision one way or the other. We also recommend the establishment of a limitation period within which grievances must be raised. These are the principal elements of formalization which we would inject into the system. Under our proposed time limit, a student grievor could force a grievance through the administrative process in a maximum of nine weeks. In the case of a faculty member starting with his department head, the process could take no more than seven weeks. However, if a grievor wishes to take advantage of formal time limits, he must observe the formality of presenting a grievance *in writing* within six weeks of the incident or last incident in a series giving rise to his grievance.

Step 1. We propose that there should be a clearly advertised line of appeal in matters of grievance by faculty and students. In the case of students, the line of appeal should commence with the *faculty member in question*, if the matter involves a single member. In the case of a faculty member the line of appeal should commence with the Head of the Department or, where no department is involved, the next appropriate administrative officer. The procedure adopted at all administrative levels should be completely informal and any investigation may be as discreet as is deemed appropriate. There should be a considerable emphasis on conciliation, as is now the case. We would emphasize here, in looking ahead, that once the grievor has exhausted the administrative line of appeal, he is entitled to a "judicial" hearing.

Any professor presented with a grievance, whether orally or in writing, should attempt to reach a settlement. If no settlement can be reached within two weeks, the professor should be required to make a definite ruling on the matter, stated briefly in writing if requested to do

so by the student. The written disposition should be given no later than *two weeks after receipt of the grievance*, but any student who wishes to insist on the time limit should be required to submit his grievance *in writing*, making some record of when it was submitted. Where the two-week limit is not observed, the student should be entitled to proceed to the next level of appeal, on the assumption that his grievance has been denied.

Unless a formal written grievance is submitted within six weeks of the incident, or last of the series of incidents complained of, the grievor should be precluded from pursuing the matter further. A limitation period of less than six weeks would tend to cut short attempts at informal settlement.

Step 2. In the case of a faculty composed of departments, a student's appeal will be taken to the *Head or Chairman of the Department*. Appeals should be allowed to be oral or in writing, but would have to be *in writing* if requested by the Head of the Department or if the student intended further to insist on time limits in dealing with the matter. Once again, if no settlement can be reached, the Head of the Department should be required to indicate in writing a definite disposition of the matter. If there is no *notification within two weeks*, the grievor should be entitled to assume an unfavourable disposition. The same rules should apply to faculty grievances, such as grievances against salary or promotion determinations, which, of course, would be initiated at the level of Department Head or Chairman.

Step 3. The right of appeal similar to that taken from an individual professor to the Head of the Department should be allowed from Department Heads to *Deans or Directors of Schools*. Where the Faculty is not departmentalized, Step 2 is omitted. The Dean should be entitled to ask that any grievances brought to him be put into writing and, once again, unless a grievance is *in writing* the grievor will have no *right to insist on time limits*, but nothing should preclude a Dean from acting on all complaints. The Dean, like the Department Head, should have complete freedom of action in seeking to settle or resolve grievances, and presumably his efforts will be largely conciliatory. There should be a *three-week time limit* for this stage of the grievance procedure, at the end of which if there is no notice of disposition, the grievor will be entitled to appeal further on the assumption that his grievance has been denied.

Step 4. The final stage of administrative appeal will be to the *Principal* who will, in all probability, delegate the disposition of

the appeal to the appropriate Vice-Principal. The same considerations with regard to the requirement of written grievances and methods of settlement should apply at this final stage as at the lower stages. The Principal's Office should be required to notify the grievor within *two weeks* of the disposition of the grievance and in the event of a failure to give notice within the time limit, the grievor should be entitled to treat his grievances as denied and to seek a hearing from the Ultimate Tribunal by applying to the "Filter".

We propose that a grievor will lose his right of appeal if he has not served written notice of his intention to appeal further within one week after notification that he has been given an adverse decision. If an administrative decision-maker at any level of appeal elects not to give notice that the appeal has been denied but rather to allow the two- or three-week time limit to run, the grievor need not give notice of further appeal until one month has elapsed after the date upon which he became entitled to assume that a decision not in his favour had been made. We propose that the time limits imposed from the various stages of administrative appeal should be allowed to be extended by agreement. This agreement will have to be in writing if subsequently to be relied upon. Any special hearings or inquiries should thus be completed within the time limits unless the grievor consents to an extension.

There are two further aspects of this proposed formalization of the structure for dealing with grievances which are important if the structure is to function effectively. First, we contemplate that in most cases where a grievor does not get satisfaction as a result of informal approaches to a professor or member of the administration, he will ask the assistance of some recognized campus organization or individual in pursuing his grievance through these more formal channels. He may proceed without such support, but most grievors would probably prefer to be assisted. Second, we do not propose any particular procedure to be followed at any of the administrative stages of the grievance proceeding. We would expect the decision-makers to continue to be as fair and open-minded as they have assured us they now are. The power of consultation should not be limited in any way. We emphasize again that once the grievor has exhausted the administrative line of appeal, he is entitled to a "judicial" hearing.

We recognize that the power to make many decisions on matters of grievances or discipline is in fact vested in Faculty Boards and their committees. Whatever body has in fact made the decision, or is by the rules of the particular Faculty or Department empowered to make the decision, for purposes of the grievance system the decision should be treated as having been made by an individual professor, a Department Head, Dean or the Principal, as the case may be, and the time limits applicable to his decision will apply. Under our proposed system no person in the administrative grievance chain should deal formally with the grievance or appeal until he is satisfied that the preceding

stage has been completed.

(B) Administrative Disciplinary Procedures, Including Expulsion and Suspension from the University. The essence of our proposal for discipline may be simply stated. We propose no changes in the process by which the initial decision to discipline either a faculty member or a student is arrived at, but any student or faculty member subjected to any decision adverse to his individual interests should have the right to appeal to the next highest decision-maker in the administrative chain, and his appeal should be regarded as a grievance against the decision. Thus the processes of grievance and disciplinary appeal are to be indistinguishable.

Any decision should be regarded as a disciplinary decision capable of appeal if it is adverse to the individual interests of a member of the faculty or a student, and is made on the basis that he has failed in some way to live up to the general or particular standards of the University. We have already referred to the range of sanctions available against both students and staff in our consideration of a Code of Conduct. It is worth stressing that the disciplining of a faculty member is similar to discipline in any professional employment situation. Adverse recommendations which affect promotions, salary and employment status generally are the main sanctions. If there is a grievance against a staff member with discipline as the end in view, the grievor as well as the staff member should be entitled to appeal the matter up to the "Filter". Since the channels for grievance and disciplinary appeals are the same, the line of progression will be clear in either case.

To expedite appeals up the administrative chain and through the filtering process to the Ultimate Tribunal, notification of any disciplinary measures should clearly set out the penalty and the transgression for which it has been imposed, the person to whom the appeal can be made and how, and the limitation period for the appeal. It should also indicate support persons to whom the appellant can turn for assistance.

The time for appeal in such cases should be at least one week, which is the time recommended above for appeals on grievances, or such longer period as the decision-making body may allow. Where no notice specifying the time for appeal has been given, the six week limitation period applicable to the filing of grievances should apply.

Discipline, particularly discipline of a severe kind, should not be meted out until the person disciplined has been given a full and fair opportunity to hear the case against him, and to present evidence and make arguments on his own behalf before an unbiased decision-maker. Indeed, the courts of law will almost certainly require that these rules of natural justice be adhered to by any University body in reaching any such decision. In our view, any measure of discipline is unfair if the person disciplined has not been given a chance to make his case. We therefore propose that no penalty other than a reprimand or a warning be put into effect until the person disciplined has exhausted all channels of appeal, or grievance, as we have previously referred

to them, open to him, or until that individual has allowed the time for appeal to lapse. The University administration must, however, retain the power, where necessary, to relieve any staff member of his duties pending the outcome of his appeal, provided that full salary and benefits continue. This action could be grieved against through normal channels if it were considered to be an arbitrary infringement of the right to teach, for example.

We assume that no decision to expel or suspend a student from the University would be made without very serious consideration at all levels of the administration. At present decisions to expel on disciplinary grounds must be made by the Senate. We recommend that the Senate no longer exercise this function. Instead, such decisions should be made through the normal disciplinary channels and subject to the full range of appeal. Adverse decisions on matters of salary, promotion and the like might also be regarded as measures of discipline against faculty members. Appeals against such decisions should follow normal grievance channels.

Equivalently serious sanctions for faculty members are at present dealt with by procedures under the University's "Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure", which is considered at the end of this Chapter.

Where an appeal arises from a disciplinary decision, it will be in the interest of the administration to deal with the appeal expeditiously and to notify the appellant immediately as the decision at each stage is made. A determined appellant could, in accordance with the proposed time limits, delay his penalty in even a frivolous case for a maximum of something over a month. This, however, we do not consider unjust or inconvenient.

(C) The Dean of Student Affairs. At present the Dean of Student Affairs has an informal role as recipient of grievances, although that is not the primary function for which the position was created. He sits on a number of Boards and Committees concerned with student affairs. The Dean of Student Affairs is probably not in the position to act directly to satisfy grievances nor does he appear to have a disciplinary function at present. In Item 5 below concerning support groups we make certain recommendations with regard to persons who can be designated to assist members of the University involved in a grievance or disciplinary procedure. For reasons given there, it is recommended that the Dean of Student Affairs not be made part of the formal grievance or disciplinary structure at Queen's.

(D) Disciplinary Decisions in the Library System. There is little to say in connection with Library decisions that would not be a repetition of proposals with regard to administrative disciplinary decisions. Library infractions calling for discipline and the line of grievance appeal over matters of library administration should be publicized. Logically, a chain of library appeals should lead to the Principal's Office and thus be subsumed under the head of "Administrative Grievance Process" which, of course, includes appeals from discipline. Whether or not the final stage of the administrative appeal for library matters is to be the Office of the Principal, we would propose

that the appeal be able to be taken to the "Filter" and from there to the Ultimate Tribunal if appropriate. Library fines have the approval of tradition, and we are not opposed to their continuance. It is most unlikely that an appeal against a library fine would ever pass the "Filter".

In the Library, as elsewhere in the administration, a degree of informality in conciliation in the working out of both grievances and appeals from discipline is considered desirable by most people in the Queen's community. This informality can be retained as long as ultimately there is the right of appeal to a "judicial" tribunal.

(E) Residence Disciplinary Tribunals. The various residences in Queen's are organized in several different ways and depend financially and otherwise on the University in varying degrees. This Committee does not have jurisdiction to do more than make gratuitous recommendations for Elrond College and some of the other residences associated with Queen's. In any case, no one disciplinary structure would be uniformly satisfactory. We therefore propose that the details of the structure and procedures for dealing with discipline in the residences should be worked out by the new Residences Board, now established as a committee of Senate, for those residences over which it has jurisdiction, and by the governing bodies of each of the other residences. Procedures established should be designed, however, to ensure a fair hearing before any penalty is imposed and regulations should be readily available to all residents.

It is proposed, moreover, that if the governing body of any residence attached to Queen's wishes to make use of the A.M.S. Court, it should be permitted to do so. Each residence should establish mechanisms as it sees fit to deal with its own disciplinary problems, but in the interests of consistency in the University community we urge the governing bodies of the various residences to allow an appeal from any residence disciplinary tribunal to the A.M.S. Court on certain specified grounds approved by the governing bodies. We suggest that the grounds should be: (i) misinterpretation of the Code of Conduct or any promulgated body of rules or regulations; (ii) bad faith, bias or other failure to observe the rules of natural justice; (iii) manifest unequal treatment or other injustice in the penalty.

(F) A.M.S. Court. We propose that the A.M.S. Court be retained and given some new functions. At present, section six of By-Law No. 13 of the Constitution of the Alma Mater Society provides that "all appeals from a decision rendered by the A.M.S. Court shall be heard by the Senate Committee on Student Affairs". We propose the transfer of that right of appeal to the "Filter" and through it to the Ultimate Tribunal on grounds of: (i) misinterpretation of the Code of Conduct or any properly promulgated body of rules or regulations; (ii) bad faith, bias or other failure to observe the rules of natural justice; (iii) manifest unequal treatment or other injustice in the penalty.

We have already stated that the governing bodies of the various residences should establish a right of appeal from the disciplinary tribunals of the various residences to the A.M.S. Court on the

same grounds upon which an appeal may be taken from that Court to the Ultimate Tribunal.

The A.M.S. Court should continue to exercise jurisdiction over students in the following matters:

- (a) any violation of an appropriately published rule or regulation in the University which is punishable by probation or a more serious sanction, except where the rule or regulation in question expressly assigns jurisdiction to a body or person other than the A.M.S. Court;
- (b) any failure to comply with the directions of an official of the University acting within the scope of his authority, except where the direction is to comply with a rule or regulation which assigns jurisdiction to a body or person other than the A.M.S. Court;
- (c) any violation of the civil or criminal law which affects the orderly functioning of the University as set out in the Code of Conduct, except plagiarism, cheating, furnishing false information to the University, forgery, and misuse of University documents.

Any other violation of the Code of Conduct should be dealt with by the University administration, subject to the right of appeal which we have proposed. We urge that where rules and regulations are published in accordance with our recommendations, the jurisdiction of the A.M.S. Court over students should not be excluded without good reason. The present jurisdiction of the A.M.S. Court, as specified in the A.M.S. Constitution, is consistent with these recommendations.

The A.M.S. Court should have power, as determined by the Code of Conduct, to invoke the full range of sanctions for conduct contrary to the Code, including suspension and expulsion. In the case of any sanction which calls for the student to withdraw from the University, he should have the right to appeal directly to the Ultimate Tribunal, by-passing the "Filter" if he wishes. In no case would the order to withdraw from the University become effective until the Ultimate Tribunal had ruled on the matter or the time for appeal had elapsed.

2. The "Filter"

Our proposal is that there be a right to appeal to an Ultimate Tribunal from grievance decisions reached by the administration, including those on appeals from discipline, and from decisions from the A.M.S. Court. A major concern with our proposals is, of course, that appeals might be taken as a matter of course to the Ultimate Tribunal without adequate grounds or where there is so little at stake, in terms of principle or otherwise, that the appeal would constitute an unjustified demand on the system and on the time of people involved. In the system of public courts this difficulty is overcome partly by the charging of costs. In University appeals if the unsuccessful party were required to pay costs, frivolous appeals would be largely eliminated but so too would justifiable appeals by people who simply could not afford to run the risk of being burdened with costs. In our opinion some other method of filtering out unjustifiable appeals should be adopted.

Our proposal is that there be a "Filter" tribunal with jurisdiction to determine conclusively whether there is a case to go to the Ultimate Tribunal. This "Filter" may well be the keystone of the whole structure that we propose. Two things seem clear: first, if the whole structure of grievances and discipline which we propose is to be widely credible, the "Filter" must be credible, since a great many matters will go no further than the Filter; second, the "Filter", however credible, will be involved in hard decisions which will make it the subject of attack by both radicals and reactionaries. This makes it important that, whatever its composition, the decision-maker in the filtering position should change quite frequently.

We propose that there be a panel of the fourteen student senators, excluding the A.M.S. President or his delegate, and fourteen faculty senators drawn by lot. When a case reaches the Filter, the grievor and the Principal's delegate will draw by lot the names of three of the student senators and three of the faculty senators who would constitute the "Filter" for that case. For the next case in any academic year, members would be drawn from the remaining eleven of each group until there were only two faculty and two students who had not served. At that point all the names would be replaced for drawing.

The "Filter" committee thus selected would meet to consider the appeal application for which it was selected. Any appeal that would go forward to the Ultimate Tribunal must have the approval of three members of the panel. Most cases will involve students and this method of decision-making by the "Filter" puts a great strain on the student senators. However, we can think of no other means of giving the tribunal as wide credibility as it would gain if the filtering decisions were made in this way. It is realized that the responsibility would be great. We hope that the burden would not be intolerable in terms of the time involved.

The "Filter" committee would hear the argument by the parties to the grievance, or their counsel, in closed session. The "Filter" committee would have to be assisted by an able staff to ensure some consistency of decisions where differently constituted tribunals were drawn from the panel. We propose that in addition to secretarial staff, the "Filter" be assisted by a "Law Clerk", a member of the Law Faculty, who would act as an impartial non-voting Chairman at all sessions of the "Filter" and advise on matters of law. There is a precedent for such a procedure in England where benches of lay-magistrates who deal with criminal matters, including some that are quite serious, are advised by a law-clerk, usually a senior practising lawyer.

The "Filter" should be empowered to dispose of appeals in any one of three ways. It could dismiss the appeal as unjustified, it could send the appeal on to the Ultimate Tribunal, or it could order a debate on the matter at short notice in the Senate or in another appropriate deliberative body of the University.

We are impressed by the notion that some grievances are not really matters of individual concern, but are really objections to University policies or structures. A relatively small proportion of grievances instituted at the lowest levels are of this type, but this is the type of grievance that tends not to get settled at the lower levels by conciliation. Under our

proposals for the early stages of dealing with grievances, this sort of policy or political grievance would probably move very quickly through the grievance procedure. In some cases the grievance will, in essence, be an objection to the whole basis of the University's organization, reflecting, as the University does to a considerable extent, the organization of society. In other cases policy grievances will be objections against specific University policies. Our Committee does not take either type of grievance lightly, but feels that a grievance procedure which calls for an issue to be framed in terms of the "guilt" or "innocence" of an individual provides an inappropriate forum for the discussion of such matters. We therefore propose that the "Filter" have very considerable authority to determine that although a grievance is not an adjudicative matter and therefore not suitable for the Ultimate Tribunal, it does raise questions of principle and policy which should be debated, and in such cases to set the matter down for debate on the floor of the Senate or in another appropriate deliberative body of the University.

We propose that when the "Filter" has determined that a grievance or disciplinary appeal is really a vehicle for furthering a policy dispute, it have power to order that debate should take place within a very few weeks and an opportunity should be accorded to the grievors to make their case on the floor of the Senate. This function, of course, places a grave burden on the "Filter" but we see no escape from such responsibility.

It may be recalled that we have already defined an "adjudicative" matter as one that takes the form of a dispute between two parties which can be settled by finding the facts and applying to them a predetermined standard or rule. The standard may be highly specific or it may be general and nebulous. The question "Did this person break the rules of the University by cutting down a tree in front of the Principal's residence?" poses an adjudicative issue. What are the facts; and if he did in fact cut one tree down, did he break the established rule against destruction of University property? Somewhat more difficult is the question "Did this faculty member act in gross violation of his obligations to the University by refusing for three weeks to discuss anything other than the War in Vietnam with his engineering class?" Again, what are the facts, and do the facts as established constitute a breach of his obligations as a University teacher? In the second case the adjudicative tribunal must obviously grapple with "policy" questions, but to the end of determining a dispute between the faculty member and the administration. Both examples should be characterized as "adjudicative", but the second illustrates the difficulties the "Filter" may encounter where the standard against which the facts must be judged is a general one. In some cases it may be difficult to determine whether adjudication or policy debate is called for.

Where the "Filter" determines that the matter may be characterized as adjudicative, it must decide whether there is a case worth taking to the Ultimate Tribunal. The standards determining whether a case is worthy will be different for appeals from the administrative process than for appeals from the

A.M.S. Court. In dealing with the appeals from the administrative process it must be remembered that we have proposed no guarantee of due process at any level below the Ultimate Tribunal. It follows that the "Filter" should be a very coarse one in these cases. Appeals from the A.M.S. Court, on the other hand, are from decisions rendered following "judicial" consideration with all that is implied in terms of a fair hearing and other aspects of due process. In these cases, a fine "Filter" is called for.

We propose that in appeals from the administrative process the "Filter" should determine whether there is a *prima facie* case, i.e. whether the appellant has been able to show that, based on facts that he purports to be able to prove by plausible evidence, the appellant can make out a case. This standard can never be fully explicit and the result may to some degree depend on the sense of injury which the grievor conveys and the "political" climate surrounding the grievance. In some cases the appeal will be against a decision which is not governed by predetermined standards but is at the discretion of the University Administration, such as the promotion or salary of a faculty member. In such cases the "Filter" would be unlikely to find that there were any substantial grounds for appeal, unless the appellant could make out a *prima facie* case that he had not received due consideration or had been dealt with on the basis of illegitimate bias. On the other hand if his appeal is, in fact, against the nature of the discretionary powers then the question is one of policy and might be sent to the Senate for debate on short notice. In the case of appeals from the A.M.S. Court the "Filter" should allow the matter to go to the Ultimate Tribunal (except under the provision of Recommendation 31) only if the appellant can make out the *prima facie* case that the A.M.S. Court (i) misinterpreted the Code of Conduct or any promulgated body of rules or regulations in the University; (ii) decided the case in bad faith, in a biased way or otherwise failed to observe the rules of natural justice; (iii) imposed a penalty which is manifestly unequal or otherwise unjust.

The "Law Clerk" would advise the "Filter" committee on these matters. He would hear presentations made to them and delineate the issues for them, but would not be entitled to vote.

3. The Ultimate Tribunal

The Ultimate Tribunal should have final authority to decide upon the merits of adjudicative matters of grievance, which include appeals from discipline, and appeals from the A.M.S. Court. A matter is "adjudicative" when it involves the application of a predetermined standard to a set of facts, to determine whether the standard has been met in the case at hand. As has been pointed out, the process is far from mechanical, particularly where the standard is a very broad or amorphous one, such as "conduct infringing on the rights of others to study free of undue disturbance".

In the case of appeals from administrative proceedings, we propose that the Ultimate Tribunal should hold a full trial of the matter, requiring the administration to support its action by adducing evidence and by justifying argument. Facts should

be established by acceptable evidence. We would not propose that the Ultimate Tribunal be bound by the rules of evidence applied in courts, but we would propose that evidence be assessed with due concern for the frailties of hearsay evidence, opinion evidence and the like. Normally where the Ultimate Tribunal is dealing with appeals from the A.M.S. Court it will act in a reviewing capacity, rather than hearing new evidence. However, where the Ultimate Tribunal is dealing with a direct appeal from the A.M.S. Court in an expulsion or suspension case it should hold a full trial of the matter, with the onus on the prosecution to establish the disciplinary breach in question.

It is of the utmost importance that the Ultimate Tribunal be credible to the widest possible spectrum of opinion in the University. We think this may be best attained by a tribunal quite similar to the arbitration model, appointed *ad hoc* for each grievance that passes the "Filter". We propose that the Ultimate Tribunal consist of an independent outside arbitrator, assisted in his hearings and deliberations by two nominees who would not, however, join in the making of the actual decision. In appeals from the administrative process, the University administration would name one of the nominees and the grievor would name the other. In appeals from the A.M.S. Court, the A.M.S. could name one nominee, the appellant the other. The nominees would then agree on an arbitrator, the only qualification being that he should be legally trained. In the event that the nominees are unable to agree on an arbitrator within two weeks, we would propose that the Chairman of the Committee of Ontario Law Deans be asked to make the choice from among those legally trained people in the Province who have had experience as Human Rights Inquiry Commissioners or labour arbitrators. Such people have experience in the kind of adjudication in which the tribunal would be involved, and this is essential if there is to be a procedure that is at once expeditious and "seen to be just". Where the Chairman of the Committee of Ontario Law Deans is from Queen's, the immediate past Chairman could be asked to make the choice.

It is perhaps worth stressing that since the tribunal's jurisdiction will not include matters that are wholly "policy" or political, it would be appropriate that the arbitrator is not a member of the Queen's Community. Such an arbitrator would have to be paid at a rate of about \$100 per day. Hearings should not often exceed two days. This expense should be borne by Queen's, in accordance with our recommendations under the heading "Legal Costs and the Role of Counsel".

The nominees by the parties in interest would have three functions in addition to attempting to choose an arbitrator. They would sit with the arbitrator during a hearing and, without taking over the role of counsel, they would play some part in ensuring a sympathetic hearing for both sides. Secondly, the arbitrator might wish to confer with the nominees during or at the end of the hearing to test his thinking, or to fill in any gaps in the evidence or background matters of practice at Queen's. Finally the arbitrator would submit his decision and reasons in confidence to the nominees, with an

opportunity to strengthen or re-word it in the light of any criticism that they might offer.

At the Ultimate Tribunal level both parties should be entitled to counsel of their own choosing. In our opinion, at this level, legal fees for both sides should be paid by the University. We discuss the matter of legal fees in greater detail below.

The hearing before the Ultimate Tribunal should normally be public, but the arbitrator should have an absolute discretion to close the hearing to the public. Grievors involved and their counsel would, of course, have the right to be present at all times.

The University will be responsible for providing an appropriate place for the hearing of the Ultimate Tribunal after consultation with the outside arbitrator.

4. The Senate

Under our proposals the Senate could have three functions in the procedures for dealing with matters of grievance and discipline. The "Filter" will be a committee of the Senate, grievances deemed by the "Filter" to be mainly matters of policy would be debated on the floor of the Senate, or in another deliberative body of the University, and the Senate would always have the legislative authority to change any rules relating to grievance and discipline.

As a result of a particular case, the Senate might wish to change University rules to avoid a similar result in a subsequent case. In constitutional theory the Senate could even pass a retroactive rule which would undo or overturn a result reached by the Ultimate Tribunal. While it is highly unlikely that the Senate would ever act retroactively, in this sense the Senate does always remain theoretically the final appeal recourse. If any grievor, a person expelled for example, could persuade the Senate to debate his case and permit him to stay at the University, the Senate's ruling would obviously overrule that of the Ultimate Tribunal. Our recommendation is that the Senate, as a matter of institutional self-restraint, refuse to perform this function.

5. Support Groups

We think it essential to any successful grievance procedure that individuals who feel aggrieved not be left completely on their own to pursue their grievances. A grievance procedure works best where the grievor can make his first approach not to a decision-maker, but to a person or a group who will act as adviser and friend. The less familiar a grievor is with the overall structure and the less he feels an equal to the decision-makers whom he must approach with his grievance, the more important it is that he be able to enlist help or support. In the University grievance structure support groups are important for both faculty and students, but particularly the latter.

We propose that there should be a number of supports available to any grievor and that he should be free to choose among them. Several supports are already in existence and for them we simply recommend that they understand and accept the support role, and that their role be made known to

the University community. Any person who is held out as being available to support grievors should make himself familiar with the working of the grievance and discipline procedures. He must be able to advise on the best approach at each stage, on whether appeals should be taken and how. Each of the potential support groups should ensure that it has one officer who is thoroughly familiar with the system.

We propose that the grievor have the right to be accompanied by the person of his choice at any stage of the grievance procedure, and that his adviser be entitled to speak for him if the grievor wishes. Thus, any person is potentially a "support". However, the following might, as a matter of course, be expected to assist students: the A.M.S., Faculty Societies, Departmental Student Councils, and the Chaplain of the University.

In our opinion there should be at least one other formal "support", whose job it would be to listen sympathetically to any student's complaint and to at least give advice with regard to channels to be followed, even where a complaint seemed frivolous or obnoxious. We have already considered the role of the Dean of Student Affairs and have rejected the idea of using him formally in the grievance procedure. The Dean, as his function is presently conceived, sits on a number of Boards and Committees, some of which are part of the grievance and disciplinary structure which we have considered above, and thus he would have a duality of function out of keeping with the role of a grievance officer. It is proposed that a new post of "Grievance Officer" be created. The Grievance Officer should be the person to whom a student or faculty member could go in cases where, for whatever reason, political, social or psychological, he did not wish to enlist the support of other support persons or groups. It will not be his function to investigate formally or otherwise "dispose" of grievances.

The Grievance Officer should be a Senate appointment for a three-year renewable term from the ranks of teaching faculty. The Grievance Officer should have a reduction in other responsibilities if necessary and, if experience proves that he is still overworked, other such officers should be appointed. It is preferable that the Grievance Officer not be absolved completely from teaching duties.

To some extent the "supports" would fulfil a filtering function in the way that a trade union does in the industrial relations grievance process. The A.M.S., Faculty Societies, or the DSCs would not be under any obligation to support every grievance brought to them. They should be encouraged to see the support of grievances as one of their major functions, but such groups would not wish to waste their time and destroy their credibility by associating themselves with frivolous or fruitless grievances. Thus a student who was refused their support might well decide not to pursue his grievance, although he would always have the alternative of seeking advice and support from the Grievance Officer which would ensure that those in a minority position would not be precluded by majority authoritarianism from processing their grievances.

It is our view that the availability of supports

is very important in the case of grievances and appeals from discipline by faculty members as well. We would expect faculty members to be more able and willing to pursue their own grievances and, where they did feel the need of support, to seek out a sympathetic and knowledgeable colleague. However, we would suggest that the Faculty Association, and any other organization of faculty members which is not part of the administrative decision-making process, could appropriately play the role of support. As in the case of students, we would propose that the University Grievance Officer be available as adviser and support to faculty members who wish to turn to him.

Legal Costs and the Role of Counsel

We recommend that at any stage prior to the hearing before the Ultimate Tribunal an individual or group be entitled to be represented by counsel of his or their choice but that they be responsible for their own legal fees. Before the Ultimate Tribunal, any appellant shall have the right to counsel but the University's financial responsibility will be limited to the following:

- (a) the fee of the outside arbitrator on the Ultimate Tribunal;
- (b) the first \$500 of the legal fees incurred by the grievor and related to the appearance before the Ultimate Tribunal;
- (c) above that first \$500 amount, 75% of the grievor's additional legal fee or an additional \$1,000 whichever is the lesser;
- (d) it is understood that the legal fees referred to above are at the scale established under the Ontario Legal Aid Plan for proceedings in County Court.

It is consistent with our recommendation that the administrative grievance process should continue to be informal, and we would not require the University to pay for counsel at that stage. The Legal Aid Society of the Queen's Law School may well provide a source of relatively sophisticated free legal assistance. Moreover, it might be prohibitively expensive to require the University to pay for counsel at other than the final stage. On the other hand, the whole thrust of our recommendations is that the interests of any member of the University not be adversely affected on a personal level without affording him the opportunity, ultimately, to have his case considered anew with full judicial trappings by the Ultimate Tribunal. We trust that there will be few such cases. We think the University should undertake the obligation to pay counsel on both sides at the final stage of the grievance procedure because the "Filter" will by then have made sure that the case is a substantial one. The University should be in the vanguard of a general trend in our society away from allowing financial status to determine whether or not rights shall be vindicated.

If industrial arbitrations and arbitrations under the Public Service Staff Relations Act give any indication, it is unlikely that proceedings before the Ultimate Tribunal will take more than two days at the most and should normally be concluded in one day.

It is quite impossible to predict just how costly our recommendations with regard to the reimbursement of legal fees may prove to be. We make these recommendations on the assumption that each year there will be very few proceedings before the Ultimate Tribunal. If the University finds itself paying legal fees in more than a total of ten cases or so in the course of the year it would, in our opinion, be quite entitled to call for a

reassessment of University policy in this connection.

The Role of a Possible Ombudsman

The function of an ombudsman, as the term is most frequently used, is to receive a whole range of complaints arising from the operation of the administrative process, to select from among them some which appear to have validity, to investigate informally, to try to persuade the administrative officers concerned to make desirable changes and to report to the legislative body in order that it may provide against repeated abuses. The University Grievance Officer under our proposals will not be an ombudsman because he will have no power to correct abuses, or even to investigate, beyond making personal enquiries. His function will be to counsel, advise and support students and faculty members who wish to invoke the grievance procedure.

One possible alternative system would be to establish a Grievance Officer with authority to investigate formally or informally, and with the power to demand to see documents and to receive answers to his questions, and to order correction of errors and abuses that he discovers. He could also be given power to report to the Senate periodically with recommendations for changes in University rules and regulations. This proposal appears, superficially, to have the advantage of simplicity, but this may be deceptive.

It would be very difficult to fill the position of "ombudsman". The incumbent would have to appear credible in the eyes of most members of the Queen's community, and if he lost credibility, the whole system of grievance and discipline would appear authoritarian. Inevitably, the ombudsman would receive a quantity of frivolous and "political" grievances so that in some ways he would have to establish a system of priorities to determine which grievances he would pursue first and most diligently. If he simply selected those complaints that appeared best founded, the result would be a loss of credibility on his part. In a community the size of Queen's, such a spot-checking function is not the most appropriate because the community is small enough to ensure the systematic correction of mistakes and abuses.

We are well aware that there are individuals on the faculty or on the supporting staff who, by reason of position or personality have a very useful ability to "get things done", particularly on behalf of students. This is a valuable aspect of the informality we are so anxious to preserve.

If the "ombudsman" alternative were adopted many matters that are now, and under our recommendations would continue to be, worked out with the professor or administrator concerned, and probably settled, would languish somewhere in the files of the ombudsman. If, to cut down his workload, the ombudsman insisted that he would only receive complaints after settlement in the administrative process has been attempted, he would simply be substituting himself for the "Filter" and Ultimate Tribunal which we have proposed. We think the mechanisms that we have proposed would be preferable.

As an alternative, the creation of an ombudsman's office might be superimposed upon the proposals that we have made. He would then act as a spot-check to ensure the working of our proposed system, and could make important recommendations to the Senate for the improvement of grievance procedures and the rules and regulations of the University generally. At the moment, we do not feel that this extra function is necessary, although it might come to be more desirable particularly if the University grows much larger.

Decisions on Academic Tenure

Because the granting, withholding or withdrawal of tenure

for faculty members may be related to disciplinary action or a grievance, we have found it impossible to exclude the consideration of the procedures relating to tenure from our report. We note that the current Senate Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure section IV specifically sets forth a grievance procedure. That procedure is broadly consistent with our proposals, but we recommend that it be amended to be fully consistent in all respects with the recommendations outlined above in Part IV of our report.

The Senate Committee on Appointment, Promotion, Tenure and Leave is currently reviewing the functions of the Tenure Appeal Committee. On the assumption that the Tenure Appeal Committee will continue to exercise the function of ensuring that proper procedures have been followed in a given case, and that they have been applied in a fair and equitable manner, we make only the following recommendation: that it be made very clear that the decision to grant or deny tenure is to be based on an overall assessment of a probationary faculty member's performance. Thus, in no case should the tenure determination be initiated, continued or completed while a grievance or an appeal from discipline affecting the faculty member concerned is in process. Once the appeal procedure has been exhausted, the decision to grant or deny tenure may be made. This will ensure that those making the initial decision on tenure, and any tenure appeal body, will take the previous disciplinary or grievance matter into account only in a way that accords with its ultimate disposition on appeal.

Appeals against decisions relating to salary and promotion, which do not involve matters of tenure, should fall into the normal grievance channels except that they should not proceed by way of the "Filter" and Ultimate Tribunal.

We recommend that on any appeal to the Tenure Appeal Committee the applicant be advised by the Committee of the grounds upon which tenure has been denied, that he be given copies of all documents, other than *confidential* documents (as we have defined them in Chapter III) put before the Committee; and that he be told if *confidential* documents are relied upon, and informed of their contents to the extent permitted by confidentiality. In this and other matters of procedure, the Tenure Appeal Committee should consult and weigh carefully the advice of the University solicitor, or other lawyer appointed for the purpose.

As has been suggested by the Senate Committee on Appointment, Promotion, Tenure and Leave, every probationary appointed should be given a clear and unambiguous statement of the rules about probationary appointments generally applicable in his Faculty and Department or School; and of the particular conditions attaching to his case. The probationer must be made aware, on appointment, of the criteria that will be applied to the assessment of his abilities when his case comes up for tenure appraisal, and his attention specifically drawn to the procedures for appraisal that will be followed. Our view also is that it is not sufficient simply to give the appointee a copy of the Tenure Document when he is first appointed. The candidate must be made aware of any further interpretations of the statement made by the Senate.

Violence and Disruption on the Campus

We have earlier expressed our faith in the use of A.M.S. constables to police the Queen's campus. We recommend that they be given responsibility and authority to control crowds at formal university functions, including athletic and social events and to deal with disorder and disruption on the campus. Dissent is important within a university, and even strong expressions of dissent by large groups should not be stifled except where there is reasonable apprehension of danger to the safety

of persons and property. We consider the A.M.S. constables to be best capable of recognizing this value in the course of their duties. Moreover, it is a fact, perhaps an unfortunate fact, that the presence of uniformed police on the campus could well exacerbate already strained feelings in cases of demonstrations or organized dissent.

Students apprehended by A.M.S. constables in the course of such activities should be charged before the A.M.S. court, or reported to the responsible administrative officer for disciplinary consideration, as appropriate. Faculty and non-academic staff involved in such activities would, in the same way, be reported to the responsible officer of the University. Thereafter those apprehended could be dealt with in the normal course within the disciplinary structure of the University. Non-members of the University, and students and staff where appropriate, would be reported to the police.

If in the future Queen's were to be wracked by violence and destruction beyond the control capacity of the A.M.S. constables then, in our view, the system that we propose will have broken down. It is recommended that the Principal be empowered to declare, after as wide consultation as is feasible in the circumstances, with A.M.S. officers among others, that for up to 48 hours a state of emergency prevails. A state of emergency for more than 48 hours should have to be declared by the Senate, and could be rescinded only by the Senate. When a state of emergency has been declared the Principal should have the power to call for the help of the police or other public authorities. Their activities will, of course, be governed by the law of the land.

We recommend that as soon as possible after the summoning of the police, the state of emergency be declared at an end and the normal system of grievance and discipline be restored. Members of the University apprehended during the state of emergency should be disciplined by the University only in accordance with the restored system of discipline and appeals.

V. IMPLEMENTATION:

In order that the proposals embodied in this report might be implemented, we would recommend that, following its approval by the Senate, the Report be referred to the appropriate bodies within the University with instructions that action be taken where applicable. Among those bodies to which the Report might specifically be referred are —

The Faculty Boards and Schools
The Alma Mater Society
The Residence Board and Inter-Residence Council
The Senate Library Committee
The Senate Computing Committee
The Principal (concerning recommendations about action to be taken by Officers of the University).

Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure

The following statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure was adopted at the Senate meeting of April 24, 1969, and its provisions are now in effect.

1. PREAMBLE

Queen's University recognizes academic freedom as indispensable to the purpose of a university. Freedom of a faculty member to study, to teach and to record knowledge according to his best professional judgment is a prerequisite for a university to fulfil its role in society. Accordingly, academic freedom must be the right of every faculty member from the time he is first appointed. The right to academic freedom carries with it the duty to use that freedom in a responsible way, with due regard to the rights of others within the University and the community at large. The right to academic freedom also presupposes that a faculty member will strive to preserve his intellectual vitality, to play an effective part in the work of his department and faculty, and to give students regular access to his attention.

It is to be recognized that precise criteria of the responsible use of academic freedom cannot be laid down, and should be left as far as practicable to the individual to decide. The main purpose of the procedures set out in this document is to ensure that in cases of dispute the question of whether an abuse of academic freedom by a tenured member has taken place shall be decided by an impartial tribunal and shall not, in particular, be alleged simply as a means of silencing unwelcome opinions.

Subject to the provisions of this document, the University agrees to honour the terms of employment of a faculty member, whether they be for a contractually limited term or extend until normal retirement age. The acquisition of tenure by a faculty member means that the University has recognized him as one who has earned full membership in the academic community until normal retirement age. Tenure entails the right of fair consideration for increases of responsibility and salary and promotion in rank.

II APPOINTMENTS

(a) Probationary Period

The purpose of a probationary period is to enable senior colleagues, charged with the task to assess an appointee and to decide whether he merits an appointment with tenure. Probation does not imply inevitable appointment with tenure. It does imply that the University is giving very serious consideration to such an appointment.

(1) A probationary period may vary in length according to the qualifications and experience of the appointee. Senior appointments of acknowledged scholars may be and usually are made without a probationary period.

(2) An initial probationary appointment to the rank of assistant professor will not exceed 4 years; to the rank of associate professor will not exceed 3 years. Appointments to the rank of professor are not ordinarily probationary.

(3) In the case of a probationary appointment for more than two years, the University may terminate the appointment on one full academic year's notice.

(4) Ordinarily, appointments below the rank of assistant professor are from academic year to academic year. If the University decides to renew such an appointment, it shall so inform the appointee by December 31.

(b) Granting of Tenure

(1) Not later than November 15 in the academic year in which the candidate's probationary period expires, the head of the candidate's department* shall, after close and deliberate consultation with a representative group of colleagues and students, submit the following documents to the Dean of the faculty:

- (i) the candidate's curriculum vitae;
- (ii) letters of appraisal from three faculty members (not necessarily from the same department, or from Queen's, two selected by the Dean and one by the candidate);
- (iii) his own appraisal and recommendation on the granting of tenure.

The Head's appraisal shall include a careful account of the candidate's teaching performance, with an indication of the evidence on which it is based.

(2) In the case of a recommendation for tenure, the Dean shall, if he accepts it, make his own recommendation to the Principal, who shall inform the candidate by January 1 of his decision. If, even after discussion with the head of the department, the Dean is not inclined to accept it, he shall inform the candidate officially that he does not propose to recommend tenure.

(3) In case the head of the department recommends further probation or termination, the Dean shall inform the candidate officially that he has received an adverse recommendation from the head of the department.

(4) In either of the latter two cases, when the Dean officially informs the candidate of the adverse recommendation, he shall also inform him that he is entitled (within 14 days of receipt of the notice) to request the Dean in writing for (a) a prompt written or oral statement, at his choice, of the reasons for the recommendation, and/or (b) a discussion of his case with the head of the department or the Dean, separately or together. In addition or alternatively he may, within three weeks of the written notice advising of an adverse recommendation, request in writing to the Dean either (1) an interview with the Principal, whose decision, after hearing submissions from the head of the department, the Dean and the candidate, shall be final, or (2) that his case be brought before the Tenure Appeal Committee. (See Appendix)

(5) If the Tenure Appeal Committee is requested by the candidate to review his case, then the committee shall study

the appraisals and recommendations, discuss the case with the Dean and head of the department, and arrange a meeting with the candidate. The candidate may be accompanied by counsel. The committee may request additional letters of appraisal. The committee may request a joint meeting with the Dean, the head of the department, and the candidate (and his counsel).

(6) If a recommendation unfavourable to the appellant is reached by the Tenure Appeal Committee, the chairman shall so inform him and shall give him further opportunity for discussion with the committee. The committee shall then confirm or revise its recommendation and submit it to the Principal, whose decision shall be final.

(7) If the candidate makes, within the prescribed period, no written request for consideration as detailed above, the Dean shall forward his recommendation to the Principal, reporting also the recommendation of the head of the department. The Principal's decision shall be final.

(8) The final recommendation and decision may be for tenure, further probation or termination, but no further period of probation shall be longer than two years.

(9) In all disputed cases the Principal's decision should be communicated to the candidate as early as possible, and not later than February 1.

(10) At the end of any further probationary period, the procedure followed shall be the same except that the recommendations and decision shall either be for tenure or for termination.

(c) Resignation

The probationary appointee who does not intend to accept a tenured appointment at the end of his period of probation will be expected so to inform the University as soon as possible, and at least three months before the expiry of that period. Any tenured member of the academic staff may terminate an appointment by giving reasonable notice which should, if possible, be not less than six months.

III DISMISSAL

(a) During Probationary Period

In the case of an initial probationary period of more than two years' duration, the appointment may be terminated by the University at the end of an academic year other than the last, in accordance with the following procedure: the head of the department shall make his recommendation for termination to the Dean of the faculty by June 15 of the year preceding that in which he wishes the appointment to terminate. The Dean shall inform the appointee of this recommendation by July 1. From this point the procedure will be that laid down in paragraphs II (b) (4) to (b) (10). The final decision shall be communicated to the candidate not later than September 1.

*In faculties and schools of the University which do not have departments, the Dean of the faculty shall be considered as the head of the candidate's department insofar as the interpretation of these regulations is concerned.)

(b) Appointments with Tenure

No faculty member appointed with tenure shall be dismissed before retirement age, except for adequate cause. Adequate cause includes persistent neglect of duty, refusal to carry out reasonable assignments, or gross misconduct that unfits a person to continue as a member of faculty. Gross misconduct does not include free inquiry, discussion, exercise of judgment or honest criticism of matters whether inside or outside the University, or any combination of these activities. Cases of failure to carry out reasonable duties because of physical or emotional disability ought, where circumstances permit, to be treated separately from dismissal cases.

(1) When the Dean of a faculty or the director of a school or any other officer responsible for academic appointments is satisfied that there is adequate cause to justify his recommending that a faculty member should be dismissed, he shall forthwith notify the member and he shall invite the member to meet with him in the presence of the head of his department, if any, and a disinterested professor having tenure who is acceptable to the officer concerned and the member. The member may be accompanied by his counsel or other adviser. At this meeting it is the duty of all present to make an honest attempt to settle the matter.

(2) If the attempt to settle the matter fails, the Dean or the officer concerned shall forthwith notify the Principal of his recommendation, and inform the member in writing of all the charges against him in sufficient detail to enable him to prepare his defence.

(3) (a) If the member decides to contest dismissal, the Principal, upon receiving the Dean's or officer's recommendation, shall meet with the member, and together they shall attempt to name a Dismissal Arbitration Committee of three professors with power to investigate the matter, and decide whether adequate cause exists. The three professors shall choose one of their number as Chairman and the decision of the committee shall be by majority.

(b) If the Principal and the member cannot agree on three professors, they shall each choose one professor and these two shall appoint a single arbitrator.

(c) In the event that the two cannot agree, a single arbitrator shall be appointed according to section 8 of the Arbitrations Act.

(d) Where a single arbitrator has been appointed, the two professors chosen by the Principal and the member shall act as advisory to the arbitrator, but the arbitrator alone shall make the decision.

(e) In this section, "professor" means a tenured assistant, associate or full professor.

(f) For the purpose of these regulations, the expression "Arbitration Committee" shall mean either the "Dismissal Arbitration Committee" or the single arbitrator, as the case may be.

(4) When the Principal has met with the member, the Dean may, in his discretion, relieve the member of his University duties until the Arbitration Committee has made its decision.

(5) The Arbitration Committee shall notify all persons party to the dispute of the time and place at which they intend to hear the parties. Notice of the hearing must be given at least one week in advance. Meetings of the Arbitration Committee shall be closed.

(6) Both parties shall have the right to appear in person, with or without counsel, and to examine and cross-examine witnesses.

(7) Both parties may summon witnesses to appear at the hearings. Members of the faculty or administration other than the member himself should consider themselves morally obliged to appear as witnesses, when summoned.

(8) The committee shall give its decision and the reason for its decision. Such decision shall be final on the question of adequate cause and binding on the member and on the University.

(9) The decision of the committee shall, except under exceptional circumstances, be reported within a month from the completion of the hearing.

(10) If the Arbitration Committee is of the opinion that adequate cause was not proven, the parties and all persons present at the hearing shall treat everything that was discussed or disclosed at the hearing with utmost confidence. If the Arbitration Committee is of the opinion that adequate cause was proven, the member is liable to dismissal, and he may obtain upon request a full transcript of the hearing and a copy of the findings and opinions of the Arbitration Committee for his own use.

(11) A member shall be entitled to his full salary up to the date on which the decision is communicated to him. In addition, the Principal shall, after taking into account all aspects of the case, recommend a severance payment up to the amount of one year's salary, or no payment whatever, as he may in his discretion decide.

(12) Notwithstanding a finding of adequate cause, the Principal may, in exceptional circumstances, decide against dismissal. In this event, the member shall be put on probation for a period of three years, without loss of rank, but in all other respects he will be subject to the same provisions as a new staff member.

IV GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE

(1) The University recognizes that in some circumstances the grounds for personal grievance may take forms other than dismissal without cause.

(2) A faculty member who has a complaint should first discuss his problem with the head of his department.

(3) If the faculty member is not satisfied with the outcome of his discussion with the head of his department, he may set out his complaint in writing and submit one copy to the head of his department, and one to the Dean. The letter shall clearly indicate that the grievance procedure of this section is being invoked. The head of the department shall, within the two weeks next following his receipt of the written complaint, make a written reply to the faculty member and submit a copy to the Dean.

(4) If the faculty member is not satisfied with the written reply of the head of the department he may, within the two weeks next following receipt of that reply, ask for a meeting with the Dean and the head of his department. The Dean shall arrange for such a meeting to be held as soon as possible, and shall invite a disinterested professor, acceptable to himself and to the faculty member, to attend. All persons participating shall make every effort to resolve the difficulty. Following the meeting, the Dean shall provide the faculty member with a written statement of the disposition of the matter.

(5) If a faculty member is not satisfied with the outcome of the meeting with the head of his department and the Dean, he may, within two full weeks of his receipt of the written statement, take his case to the Principal. The Principal may make a final decision at that point or at his discretion he may seek the advice of a committee of investigation chosen by lot from the Tenure Appeal Committee.

(6) The faculty member may be accompanied by his counsel at the meeting convened by the Dean and at the meeting with the Principal.

Section IV is now replaced by recommendations 47 to 50 of the Statement on Grievance, Discipline and Related Matters

APPENDIX

TENURE APPEAL COMMITTEE

The Tenure Appeal Committee shall be a standing sub-committee of the Senate Committee on Appointment, Promotion, Tenure and Leave. The Tenure Appeal Committee shall consist of the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Appointment, Promotion, Tenure and Leave, who shall be an *ex-officio* member, and five other tenured members of faculty, two of whom shall be, or shall have been, members of the Senate Committee on Appointment, Promotion, Tenure and Leave. The Senate should ensure that the Tenure Appeal Committee is broadly representative of faculties and ranks. The Tenure Appeal Committee shall appoint its own Chairman. The terms of office of committee members shall be three years, and members shall be eligible for re-appointment. One-third of the original membership of the committee shall be appointed for one year, one-third for two years, and one-third for three years.

Not later than March 1 of each year the Dean of each faculty shall submit a tenure report to the Tenure Appeal Committee. The report shall contain a summary of all decisions reached concerning probationary appointees. In addition, the Dean shall make available, on request of the committee, any of the files on individual appointees referred to in the Dean's report. The committee will be expected to examine a sampling of these files each year in order to become familiar with normal cases, and thus be better prepared to consider a disputed decision. The Tenure Appeal Committee shall review the annual tenure reports of the Deans, and may make recommendations to the Committee on Appointment, Promotion, Tenure and Leave about revision of the policy and rules concerning tenure. The Tenure Appeal Committee shall hear cases upon request as set out in Section II (b) (4) above.

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 20, 1973

QUEEN'S GAZETTE

A SUPPLEMENT TO VOLUME V, NUMBER 24.

STATEMENT ON ACADEMIC LEAVE POLICY

STATEMENT ON ACADEMIC LEAVE POLICY

The primary purpose of granting academic leave to members of faculty is to enable them to enhance their quality as scholars, teachers, and researchers, thereby assisting the University to achieve greater excellence in its basic areas of responsibility — effective teaching and the advancement of learning.* To further these concerns, the Committee on Appointment, Promotion, Tenure and Leave recommends that there be two forms of academic leave — sabbatical and negotiated.

THE SABBATICAL **

Purpose

Sabbatical leave is to provide faculty members with an opportunity to make a temporary change in the normal pattern of academic duties. Such leave should be considered to fall within the scope of an individual's normal university responsibilities. These responsibilities include intellectual inquiry and activities related to the maintenance and further development of faculty excellence in teaching and scholarship.

Eligibility to make Application for Sabbatical

A full time member of faculty is eligible to apply for a sabbatical after six years of service at Queen's since appointment or the previous sabbatical. Years taken on negotiated leave or another form of leave (e.g. "political" leave of absence) should not be counted towards eligibility to apply for sabbatical leave. If service prior to appointment at Queen's is to be counted towards the period of first eligibility, this must be settled at the time of appointment.

Eligibility of Deans and Department Heads for Sabbatical

Except under special circumstances and unless there exists a suitable deputy, deans and department heads shall not take prolonged leave of any kind during a term of office. Upon completion of their administrative duties, deans and department heads shall be entitled to special consideration for sabbatical leave.

Location of the Sabbatical

A sabbatical usually will be tenable away from the Queen's campus but consideration will be given to proposals for a sabbatical in Kingston.

Length of the Sabbatical

The sabbatical is normally for twelve months, beginning July 1st or January 1st, but applications will be considered for six month sabbaticals beginning on either of the given dates.

Obligation to Return

Faculty members who have taken a sabbatical leave shall be under an obligation to return to the University for a period of time equal to the length of the leave.

The Statement on Academic Leave Policy was adopted by the Senate at its meeting of March 22, 1973, and was approved by the Board of Trustees in May, 1973. The terms specified will apply for the first time to leave being taken at the beginning of 1974.

A Word of Explanation of the Statement on Academic Leave Policy was published in The Queen's Gazette, Vol. V, Number 6, February 14, 1973, and further copies are available in the Senate Office.

* Quite different considerations attach to leave of absence in order to seek or hold full-time elective public office and this is a matter on which the Committee intends to report on another occasion.

** "Sabbatical" relates to a six month or a one year leave.

Regulations and Procedures

Within each faculty, the dean, in consultation with the faculty board, shall be responsible to the Principal for the establishment of regulations and procedures concerning sabbatical leave. All such regulations and procedures shall be in keeping with the general regulations and procedures contained in this document.

The regulations and procedures shall include a timetable giving dates by which the application for leave shall be submitted, the Principal's decision given, and the leave accepted by the applicant. This timetable shall be announced annually at the time applications are requested.

Salary Regulations *

1. Each faculty member who is granted sabbatical leave is entitled to seventy five per cent of regular salary.
2. The faculty member, if eligible, shall apply to outside granting agencies for further support.
3. Faculty members may apply to the dean for additional support from a faculty fund. This additional support might be in the form of salary or in the form of grants for research and travel expenses.
4. The total remuneration received from all sources must not exceed 100 per cent of regular salary. Grants to pay for travel and research expenses and remuneration for occasional work of a limited scope shall not be considered as remuneration for the purposes of this provision.
5. If the total remuneration as defined above exceeds 100 per cent of the faculty member's regular salary, the faculty contribution (seventy five per cent) shall be reduced appropriately.
6. A faculty member on sabbatical leave shall not accept paid employment except for occasional work of a limited scope.
7. The faculty member on sabbatical continues to be a full time member of the academic staff and eligible for all fringe benefits, salary increases and promotions.

General Procedures

1. A faculty member shall make application to the head of department by October 1st of the academic year preceding the proposed sabbatical, stating the nature of the scholarly activity to be undertaken, the location of the activity, the period of time required and any external financial support which may be obtained or has been applied for.
2. The head of the department shall review all applications for leave and forward them to the dean with his recommendations as they relate to the detailed allocation of teaching and other staff responsibilities.
3. The dean, in turn, shall forward to the Principal each departmental submission along with his own faculty-wide recommendations.
4. The Principal, on reviewing all recommendations, shall inform each applicant of his decision.

NEGOTIATED LEAVE

Purpose

Negotiated leave is to provide a faculty member with the opportunity to be released from some or all of his duties at Queen's in order to undertake other outside activities related to his discipline or field of scholarly expertise.

Eligibility

A full time member of faculty may apply for negotiated leave after any period of service.

Length of Leave

Normally a negotiated leave would be for one year or less. The faculty member is entitled to return to his full time position at Queen's upon completion of the leave.

Regulations and Procedures

Within each faculty, the dean, in consultation with the Faculty Board, shall be responsible to the Principal for the establishment of regulations and procedures concerning negotiated leave. All such regulations and procedures shall be in keeping with the general regulations and procedures contained in this document.

Salary Regulations

Arrangements for salary and fringe benefits shall be negotiated in each individual case.

General Procedures

1. A faculty member shall make application to the head of his department stating the reasons for the request, the period and location of the leave, and his proposals for pension and fringe benefit arrangements.
2. The head of the department shall review all applications for leave and forward them to the dean with his recommendations as they relate to the detailed allocation of teaching and other staff responsibilities.
3. The dean, in turn, shall forward to the Principal each departmental submission along with his own faculty-wide recommendations.
4. The Principal, on reviewing all recommendations, shall inform each applicant of his decision.

Any change in the terms of the leave (including shortening or lengthening of the period of leave) shall be treated as a new proposal.

* The implementation of this policy by faculties and departments should in no way work to the disadvantage of a full-time member of faculty within a department whose salary is funded only partly by the University.

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 6, 1972

A SUPPLEMENT TO VOLUME IV, NUMBER 43

The University Appointment: Freedom and Responsibility

Report of the Senate Committee on Appointment, Promotion, Tenure and Leave (Approved by Senate on June 22, 1972; and by the Board of Trustees in October, 1972)

At the March 2, 1971 meeting, the Senate recommended that the Senate Committee on Appointment, Promotion, Tenure and Leave review matters regarding the responsibilities of faculty on a year round basis and submit recommendations on a number of specific concerns. (See Senate Committee on Academic Development, Report Number Twenty-two, Senate agenda, March 2, 1971). To fulfill this request the Senate Committee on Appointment, Promotion, Tenure and Leave appointed a sub-committee with membership and terms of reference as shown below. Its Report on The University Appointment: Freedom and Responsibility, was approved by the Senate on June 22, 1972, and approved by the Board of Trustees at its October, 1972, meeting.

Members

Donald D. Carter, Faculty of Law
 J.A. Euringer, Department of Drama
 G.A. Harrower, Vice-Principal (Academic)
 Duncan G. Sinclair, Department of Physiology – Chairman
 M.C. Urquhart, Department of Economics
 W.E. Watt, Department of Civil Engineering

Terms of Reference

1. To review current practices and existing documents relating to the responsibilities and duties to the university of the members of faculty and to receive communications from individuals and groups within the university community on matters relating to this review.

2. To propose recommendations to the Senate Committee on Appointment, Promotion, Tenure and Leave on the adoption of a description, in general terms, of:

- (i) those activities which together constitute the work done by members of faculty to meet their responsibilities and fulfill their obligations to the university.
- (ii) the services, considerations and benefits, apart from salary and associated benefits, which the university undertakes to provide the members of faculty to enable them to meet their responsibilities.

3. To propose specific recommendations to the Senate Committee on Appointment, Promotion, Tenure and Leave on:
 - (i) the proportion of the 12-month year which constitutes the standard period of employment for which a salary is paid by the university to members of faculty.
 - (ii) the adoption of policies concerning different periods of employment for those members of faculty whose work requires deviation from the standard period of employment.
 - (iii) policies related to leaves of absence and other forms of leave, with or without recompense by the university, in relation to the standard period of employment and other periods of employment which may be adopted.
 - (iv) policies to define the extent to which members of faculty, within their periods of employment, may engage in consulting and/or other work which does not constitute a primary responsibility to the university.
 - (v) policies to define the rights of individual faculty members and of the university respectively as to the determination of salaries, periods of employment, and related matters, in relation to the total remuneration for work performed by members of faculty when part of such work does not constitute a primary responsibility to the university and for which remuneration in addition to that paid by the university is accepted.

4. To be governed in its procedures, without exception, by the rules applying to Committee Procedures (Section 30) of the Rules of Procedure of the Senate (as revised, November, 1970).

THE UNIVERSITY APPOINTMENT: FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY

The faculty member holding a university appointment has no exact counterpart elsewhere. Because of the nature of the university as an institution of intellectual enquiry, he requires distinctive freedom in the use of his time and in the direction of his enterprise; at the same time, he must accept the responsibility of ensuring that his time is well spent and that his enterprise is directed fruitfully. This concept of freedom, coupled with responsibility, is embodied in our university custom and tradition.

With the growth of the University, it has become necessary to make more explicit the responsibilities of faculty members and to provide a general statement of the nature of a University appointment. The purpose of this document is to set out the basic principles to be followed.

Faculty Member

1.1 A faculty member is a member of the University who holds the academic rank of professor, associate professor, assistant professor or lecturer.

Responsibilities of the Faculty Member to the University

2.1 The responsibilities of a faculty member are essentially determined by the responsibilities and commitments which the University itself undertakes in order to fulfill its role in society. The University, as an institution of intellectual enquiry, functions to the benefit of society through the combined efforts of its individual members.

2.2 The University's prime commitments are to foster intellectual enquiry, to provide instruction and supervision to all registered students, and to set high standards of education and training. Intellectual enquiry includes research and other creative, reflective and scholarly work and involvement of faculty members in such professional service, consulting, and related work as may complement the primary commitments of the University. The University must also arrange for the efficient conduct of its own affairs.

2.3 Each faculty member is expected, during his period of responsibility, to devote all his professional endeavours to the purposes of the University as described in the whole of this statement. Such endeavours should be exercised to the best of his abilities and in a manner consonant with his right of free enquiry and with his membership in the University community.

2.4 The nature and extent of each faculty member's endeavours are matters to be agreed upon with the University. These professional endeavours – in total comprising some combination of teaching, supervision, research, scholarship, professional service or consultative work, and administration – may vary from time to time for any individual and may differ among individuals. A faculty member's responsibilities may require him to be absent from the campus for periods of time.

Period of Responsibility

3.1 A member of faculty is responsible to the University throughout the twelve months of the year unless a shorter period of responsibility has been established.

3.2 At the initiation of either the faculty member or the University, a shorter period of responsibility may be established with the agreement of the University. A faculty member with a reduced period of responsibility is entitled to consideration by the University in matters relating to tenure, promotion, advancement, salary, leave, the University's pension plan and other employment benefits.

Responsibilities of the University to the Faculty Members

4.1 The University is committed to use its resources so as to optimize the quality of work done by all of its faculty members. It undertakes to develop, with thorough consultation and careful planning, those facilities, services and procedures which are conducive to excellence in the activities undertaken.

Professional Service, Consulting and Related Work

5.1 Professional service, consulting and related work are defined as activities involving the application of professional effort and expertise on behalf of individuals or agencies outside the University community. Activities unrelated to a faculty member's expertise constituting his commitment to the University, are not affected by the provisions of this section.

5.2 The nature of professional service, consulting and related work should be such as to complement the primary commitments of the faculty member to the University.

5.3 The nature and extent of a faculty member's participation in professional service, consulting and related work and the use of the University's facilities in connection with such work are matters to be agreed upon beforehand with the University. Such agreements may relate to specific proposals or they may be more general, relating to types of professional service, consulting and related work and to limits on the time which may be devoted to such work. Occasional professional service, consulting and related work of limited scope may be undertaken without prior agreement.

5.4 The nature of all professional service, consulting and related work and the time committed to it are to be reported.

Procedures

6.1 Within each faculty, the dean, in consultation with the Faculty Board, shall be responsible to the Principal for the establishment of regulations and procedures concerning the terms and conditions of employment for faculty members including the nature and extent of faculty members' involvement in professional service, consulting and related work. All such regulations and

procedures shall be in accordance with the principles contained in this document.

6.2 All terms and conditions of employment, including the nature and extent of a faculty member's involvement in service, consulting and related work, shall be in accordance with the principles contained in this document.

6.3 A faculty member shall be entitled to recourse to the grievance procedures established for matters relating to salary and promotion if he is unable to reach agreement with the University on the terms and conditions of his employment.

Appendix C

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY
13 July 1973

REVISED ACAU PREAMBLE

General Introduction

Planning Techniques

For some years now the Ontario Universities have been committed to the concept that cooperation in planning is an effective means of enhancing the quality and effectiveness of graduate study in this Province while conserving the available resources. The process envisioned is one which permits healthy competition to foster the growth of strong, high-quality programmes while reducing duplication to the minimum consistent with healthy competition. The fundamental concept is one of planning in concert, each University retaining responsibility to initiate planning for its own academic development while taking into account its particular capacities in relation to other elements in the Province. A further objective implicit in this approach to planning is to avoid centralized bureaucracy with its high cost and inevitable steering towards uniformity across the system.

The assessment procedure now underway by which the quality and strength of individual graduate programmes are evaluated, discipline by discipline, for the whole Ontario system is a major first step in the cooperative planning process. These 'planning assessments', as they are completed, will be built up into a mosaic portraying the distribution of both strong and weak graduate programmes and disciplines throughout the Province. With this picture, each University will be able to plan its development of graduate programmes especially at the Ph.D. level, to complement those of other Universities and to reexamine in a realistic fashion its own long-term goals and aspirations. Within the five broad discipline areas, humanities, social sciences, physical sciences, life sciences, and professional sciences, each University will have its particular array of graduate programmes. Some which are central to the purposes of all Universities will be developed by all, at least to the Masters level; other subjects may be developed in only a few Universities, those perhaps which decide on overall orientation toward one or another of the five broad discipline areas. In both cases, the planning process will proceed with each University having full knowledge of the plans of the others and, as

well, a fair, rigorous and objective assessment of the quality of its own and other programmes throughout the five broad discipline areas.

The Council of Ontario Universities has assigned to the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies the task of advising it on the development of the concept of cooperative planning. The Standing Committee which carries out these tasks for OCGS is the Advisory Committee on Academic Planning. A significant role is also played by the discipline groups, one of which is established for each subject during its assessment, with a representative from each interested University. Each discipline group has the function of assisting and advising ACAP in connection with its own subject.

It is essential that this type of planning activity does not become fragmented on a disciplinary basis. Since the development of one department in a University cannot be considered independently of its contribution to the rest of its University and of the influence of the University as a whole on the department, it is most important that Universities as institutions play a central role in the planning process. As well, it is essential to remember that the discipline planning assessments are but pieces of the total picture of quality distribution within discipline areas and over graduate study in general in Ontario. Planning requires both vision and overview; the latter at least will be provided when all of the discipline assessments are complete.

The formal documents stating the responsibilities of ACAP and the discipline groups are Appendix F. Briefly summarized, it is ACAP's function to advise on effective provincial planning at the graduate level, to enhance and sustain quality while avoiding undesirable duplication, and, to carry out formal planning reviews for disciplines. A discipline group has the responsibility of keeping under review the plans for graduate work in the discipline and making regular progress reports in connection with graduate work in that subject. To make all this possible, it has been agreed that ACAP may communicate directly with Universities and discipline groups, to request necessary information, to discuss reports, to convene meetings, and to make and receive proposals for the future.

There are three fundamental principles upon which the concept of cooperative planning is based.

1. Each University must retain the freedom and responsibility to initiate planning for its own academic development, taking into account its particular capacities in relation to other elements in the Province. Periodic discipline assessments by ACAP should form the basis for planning by the Universities of their development of graduate studies, particularly Ph.D. programmes. On the basis of these assessments, COU should make its own recommendations on currently embargoed programmes.

2. The basic determinant of graduate enrollment in every discipline must be the student's right to seek graduate study at the University which he perceives to meet his needs best. The choice of University by students must be truly 'free' and not be influenced by non-standard payments or workloads or the like. Government scholarship support (both provincial and federal) should be competitive and portable.

3. The support for graduate studies at any University should remain a matter to be determined between that University and whatever agency is directly charged by government with responsibility for the Universities. COU (and its committees, including ACAP) will distribute information among the Universities and may advise the government agency if requested on matters relating to the University system. There should be no attempt on the part of COU or ACAP to allocate numbers of students to individual Universities. Instead, more emphasis should be placed on assessing levels of quality throughout the system. This should be done by continuing appraisals of new programs conducted by the OCGS Appraisals Committee. Standards for appraisal should be established at levels compatible with international standards. In some cases these will be higher than those applied in the past. In addition, established programmes should be appraised as time and resources permit.

Special mention should be made of enrollments - the total number of graduate students in all five broad discipline areas and, with formula financing, the proxy for government spending. In the 1960's when graduate schools were expanding very rapidly there was urgent need to forecast the total number of students for which the provincial government could be expected to pay formula grants. While this is still important, graduate enrollments have now stabilized by themselves and if adequate standards are maintained it is highly unlikely that the matter of excessive numbers will arise. It is of far greater importance that planning proceed to foster the development of strong, high-quality graduate programmes to full international standards.

Enrollment forecasting is a notoriously inexact art especially if it is linked to manpower forecasting, conducted for narrow fields such as individual disciplines, or if the forecasts are made beyond a year or two into the future. Thus whereas those conducting discipline assessments have been asked to be mindful of enrollments, this data is meant to reflect the current capability of programmes within a particular discipline to deliver high quality graduate education. Where a total discipline enrollment figure is given, this should be recognized as an interim number to be replaced by a more realistic planning forecast for the whole discipline area once all of the cognate disciplines are assessed. Even when forecasts are made for each of the five broad discipline areas, it is important to realize that these will be relatively flexible. It has never been possible to foretell the future with any precision unless one establishes quotas or targets by some centralized authority. Prophecies thus made are certain to be self-fulfilling; they rarely, however, meet the needs of changing times, of new intellectual trends, of student interests, and of future employment markets.

The concept of cooperative planning may be implemented by the following procedure.

1. Each University drafts its Ph.D. enrollment targets according to the following format.

The targets are formulated entirely by each University in the first instance based on its own plans for academic development, the discipline and discipline area assessments, and information and advice from government or whatever source it chooses to consult.

2. Each University sends its draft plan to COU which communicates to each University the plans of the others and comments on the aggregate total by broad discipline area (i.e. Social Sciences, Physical Sciences, Humanities, etc.).
3. Each University the, in light of the system plans and comments by COU, revises or confirms its own draft plan and sends it to government.
4. The Government agency decides on a system aggregate prediction of Ph.D. enrollment for years 1, 2, and 3 and projections for years 4 and 5 which are communicated to: A. each University, indicating the total enrollment figure approved for funding at that University.
B. COU.
5. Where total University Ph.D. planned enrollments exceed the system total approved for funding, there will be assessment on a Province-wide basis of the quality of candidates admitted. Such a procedure would be comparable to that presently employed to select the recipients of competitive federal scholarships. The "qualified" candidates will carry government funding wherever they register. The remaining candidates would not. An individual University which registers more than the total approved for it is free to
 - A. appeal to the agency for revision of its approved total enrollment figure, or
 - B. accept students but forego the formula grant for the number in excess of the approved aggregate enrollment.

This proposal has the effect of limiting trade-offs between graduate enrolments at the doctoral level and other kinds of enrollment. It is quite possible that the government agency will wish to approve overall figures for other kinds

of enrollment for funding. In general, flexibility should be maintained in permitting trade-offs between projected masters level and undergraduate enrollments with the obvious exceptions of those professional programs which are specifically limited. The line between masters and undergraduate work is becoming increasingly indistinct. The critical admission decision concerns formal entrance to doctoral programs. Moreover, it is at the doctoral level that matters of quality control within limited resources are particularly crucial and that is why we have described a process designed to deal with these specific problems.

This process would preserve the responsibility of the individual university to plan for its own academic development. At the same time it allows for COU and ACAP's objective assessment of system-wide strengths and weaknesses in graduate studies to influence the enhancement of high-quality programmes throughout the system. 'Rationalization', as that is required, can proceed by cooperative planning, through the surveillance of standards and exchange of information; unnecessary duplication can be avoided, and, most important, students can themselves continue to choose the University in which they wish to pursue doctoral work. In the end it is the reputation and real quality of good departments which will attract students, and thus strength, to a particular University. If artificial recruitment devices and unequal financial inducements are eliminated, this sophisticated and perceptive market will produce the rational development the system needs and government demands.

Extract from the Report of the Principal's Committee on Resource Allocation for the year 1972 - 73.

the coming year. The Committee has formed no judgement about an "optimum" age/salary/rank profile for Queen's. It has concluded that the present profile cannot be maintained in future years if the necessary degree of flexibility in allocating resources is to be maintained and that actions for 1972/73 must be taken with the longer term goal of greater flexibility in mind.

6. GUIDELINES FOR GENERAL UNIVERSITY SERVICES

As already mentioned the target is an approximate average 5 percent reduction in these areas which include physical plant, general administrative services and costs of library and computing services. Actual reductions will vary from unit to unit. The Committee has judged it important to maintain the library budget for purchase of books, periodicals and documents at the level of the current year. No cut is recommended although rising costs of these items will mean some reduction in real terms.

Numbers of staff will be reduced when appropriate by not filling vacancies as they occur as a result of resignations and retirements.

In order to implement this policy it is recommended that the following rule will apply:

No vacant position may be filled without prior review and approval by the Vice-Principal Finance with the advice of the Director of Personnel.

7. GUIDELINES FOR ADMINISTRATION OF FACULTY BUDGETS

It is recommended that Faculty budgets will be divided into two main elements:

- (i) academic salaries including full-time, part-time casual.
- (ii) support staff salaries and other expenses.

As discussed earlier, the guidelines below are intended to introduce more flexibility in the allocation of resources within faculties. Some of the factors involved in adjusting limited teaching resources to cover increased responsibilities have been discussed in an earlier section. These include changes in section sizes, number of sections, numbers of courses offered, and teaching loads. The Committee encourages Deans to adopt a flexible approach in making such adjustments. It is clear that no single solution will be best in all circumstances. In the interests of achieving long term flexibility, however, Deans are encouraged to increase, where possible, the proportion of academic salary budget spent on term, sessional, part-time and casual appointments. Deans may also wish to reconsider traditional policies on purchases of equipment, travel etc. within their faculties.

Transfers will be normally permitted from (i) to (ii).

Transfers will not be permitted from (ii) to (i) except in very unusual circumstances.

It is recommended that within these general rules and the normal rules governing budget administration, Deans should be free to allocate Faculty resources subject to the following rules.

1. All new appointments will be made on a term or sessional basis. Only in exceptional and well justified cases will new tenured appointments or new probationary appointments leading to consideration for tenure be approved. This restriction will include part-time tenured appointments where these exist. These restrictions will apply immediately in the current year and remain in effect until modified in the light of proposals put forward by the Task Force on the Steady State.
2. To the extent made possible by the implementation of the first guideline increases in the proportion of academic salary budgets allocated to non-tenured and casual academic staff are to be encouraged. Wherever possible these increases should be used to

provide teaching assignments to graduate students giving them teaching experience and financial support to the extent allowed by government regulations.

3. Sabbatical leaves will be granted under current terms and conditions and only to the extent that it is possible for the work of a Faculty to be carried out without a net increase in the salary budget of the Faculty due to sabbatical leaves.
4. Deans will be asked not to fill non-academic positions which fall vacant without careful review of the need for the position in consultation with the Director of Personnel.

8. LONG RANGE IMPLICATIONS

The Committee has examined possible approaches to the manner in which resources are provided to the various faculties. There has been a natural tendency in the past to budget in a basically incremental fashion which provides rough justice during a period of fairly rapid expansion. Difficulties arise, however, when resources shrink relative to responsibilities and this is the situation with which we are now confronted. A more satisfactory approach is therefore required to replace the incremental approach.

A possible method for the longer run, is to re-examine in a more fundamental way the objectives of each instructional program and the methods by which those objectives might best be achieved in relation to the resources available. This will mean careful study of alternatives to present ways of using resources and deliberate weighing of advantages and disadvantages of these alternatives for both cost and effectiveness. The process will involve, to echo the words of the Senate Budget Committee once again, the determination of "priorities with great thought and care, and with precision of a high degree."

A review of this nature is, however, a longer term project and we do not think it appropriate for this Committee to do more than suggest that the Senate Committee on Academic Development and the budget officers of the university be asked to begin working together on it without delay. Only in such a way can we arrive at an optimum pattern of resource allocation in the longer run.

The first step towards making improvements in the system for the future is to begin immediately to reduce fixed commitments wherever possible. The recommendations of the Committee are intended to make such a beginning in 1972/73. For the longer run we look to the work of the Task Force on the Steady State and the Senate Committees on Academic Development and the Senate Committee on Appointment, Promotion, Tenure and Leave.

For 1972/73 however, we recommend that the budget officers allocate available resources to the Faculties on a basis which will take into account to the extent appropriate, existing commitments which cannot quickly be changed, and make allowance as well for recent and expected shifts in shares of teaching responsibilities. We recognize the difficulties in making large adjustments quickly. But beginning must be made at once where possible.

J.J. Deutsch (Chairman)
Principal

J.A. Bennett
Associate Professor of
Electrical Engineering

D.H. Bonham
Vice-Principal (Finance)

D. Campbell
Professor of Psychology

G.A. Harrower
Vice-Principal (Academic)

D.M. Robertson
Professor of Pathology

Extract from

VIII UNIVERSITY/GOVERNMENT INTERFACE FOR PLANNING

At the beginning of this report we reviewed the assumptions on which our long-range plans have been based. It must be acknowledged, however, that our planning can have little significance unless the procedures for achieving coordination within the Ontario system are reasonably well agreed upon and understood. Until the present time it would be fair to say that such system coordination has concentrated on the short term rather than the long term. Enrolment projections provide the best illustration of this. The Committee on University Affairs in consultation with the Council of Ontario Universities and the Department of Colleges and Universities recommends each January an official forecast of overall enrolment for the following academic year. The main purpose of this forecast is to limit the budgetary commitment of the government to a fixed amount, whatever the actual enrolment may turn out to be. This annual process assists budget making at Queen's Park but does not meet in any way the need for an overview and coordination of the long-range plans of the universities.

It has been widely recognized for a number of years (beginning with the Spinks Commission on graduate studies in 1965) that a system depending heavily on public funds must somehow be coordinated to avoid unnecessary and wasteful duplication of activities. This recognition has motivated the Study of Engineering Education and underlies the current discipline assessment program. The objective of avoiding duplication can best be achieved through the coordination of the long-range plans of individual institutions. Such coordination is much to be preferred to sudden short term swings in government policy aimed at immediate correction of situations which long-range coordination would have recognized and dealt with more efficiently and with less waste. The most visible example of the need for long range coordination is the series of steps taken by the government to cut down graduate enrolments.

In future the essential independence of universities will be maintained only if a process develops within which the plans of individual institutions can be adjusted from year to year through a reasonable and orderly process of review and discussion. Briefly stated, universities would propose long-range enrolment plans;

the Committee on University Affairs (or its successor) would review those plans and would ask individual universities where necessary to make adjustments in the light of the overall needs and resources of the province as seen by the Committee. The process would be continuous and iterative.

In general outline such a process would work as follows: Universities would express their intentions in enrolment projections five or six years ahead as they have been doing in annual submissions to the Committee on University Affairs. These individual submissions would not, of course, be prepared in a vacuum. Each university would base its plans not only on its estimate of the student constituency available to it and on the academic strengths which it has established or is building but also on the needs of its local community and the resources of that community and a general awareness of provincial policies at the time of preparing the long-range projection. The Committee on University Affairs (or its successor) would then examine the individual submissions and would test them in total against the following kinds of questions: Do the total enrolments in professional faculties projected five years hence appear to be reasonable? If excessive, by how much? If too low, by how much? The Committee would not attempt precise estimates of manpower needs but would use the studies now being made by a number of agencies to establish a range within which needs for each profession, for manpower are likely to fall. If the total of the various university numbers for a particular specialty seemed obviously excessive then the Committee would invite the universities with those particular programs to review their plans jointly and, if possible, agree on revised plans which would be

SCAD #4

consistent with the views of the Committee. It should be understood, however, that in this process the views of the Committee might also change. In relation to undergraduate arts and science, the Committee would indicate whether the plans of the universities appear to meet the student demand so far as that can be judged five years in advance. Such judgments would obviously be related to other matters on which the Committee would be making recommendations to government, e.g. student aid, fee policy, etc. In graduate work the Committee would face the most difficult problems. It has tended to take the view in the past that graduate work should be distributed more or less evenly throughout the university system. Queen's, on the other hand, has urged that we should plan for the future a differentiated system in which all universities would be expected to offer first class undergraduate work in a reasonable number of basic disciplines but in which the proportions of graduate and professional work would vary widely. Such wide variations already exist with respect to professional studies. Most graduate work represents professional study at a higher level and the principle of differentiation is logically applicable to it. Nevertheless, it is the responsibility of the Committee on University Affairs to indicate whether, as with professional and undergraduate work, the plans of individual universities are consistent in this area with the needs of the province and to seek adjustment in individual university plans where such consistency is lacking. Again, this should be an iterative process assisted by the discipline assessment process now underway under the auspices of the Council of Ontario Universities.

What we have been describing is a process whereby the enrolment plans of individual universities could be validated by the provincial authority which will be recommending government funding to allow implementation of plans. The process would involve a general review of enrolment plans five years ahead. After the process of adjustment has been satisfactorily carried out then there should be a firm endorsement of the plans for the next three years. Both the three year and the five year periods would be extended on a rolling basis each year. This would allow universities to plan internally with some assurance. It would be understood that if the government found it necessary to make important changes affecting enrolments within the three year period these would be announced and explained at least a year in advance of their coming into effect so that neither students nor institutions would be left with wasteful commitments. Universities themselves in turn would be committed to sticking reasonably closely to their approved plans. Plans would indeed be subject to change. They always are. But it would be change by due process on both sides. Such cooperative planning, with the initiative resting with individual universities and review and coordination the responsibility of the government advisory agency would represent a further logical step in the evolution of the unique Ontario university system based on a large degree of institutional independence coupled with voluntary cooperation. Of course it would be unrealistic to assume that every problem will be resolved voluntarily. In those cases the government authority has the right and responsibility to impose a decision. But, on the whole, we think that both universities and governments would prefer a process which allowed marginal adjustments (and most would be marginal) in university plans to be worked out on a give and take basis.

Overall numbers of students in various broad kinds of general, professional and graduate education at the university level are the clear responsibility of governments. In discharging the responsibility means are needed whereby the necessary degree of coordination among a number of independent institutions can be achieved. If maximum independence (essential to effective university teaching and research) is to be preserved and rational planning within each university encouraged, the necessary coordination must be achieved in adjustments of long-range plans on a continuing and orderly basis. We hope that attention will be paid to these objectives as the interface between university and government planning is considered in the months ahead.

